THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXI SEPTEMBER, 1935 No. 183

EDITORIAL

It is always interesting to see things from the other end. We do not mean this in the supreme sense of Mrs. Meynell's *To a Daisy*:

> From where I dwell—upon the hither side,
> Thou little veil for so great mystery,
> When shall I penetrate all things and thee
> And then look back?
>
> O daisy mine, what will it be to look
> From God's side even of such a simple thing?

We are thinking not of vision *sub specie æternitatis*, but of an earthly possibility. To take a plain case: What did the Lilliputians, or the Brobdignagians, think of Gulliver? or the Gauls of Julius Cæsar? What did the indigenous inhabitants of what we are pleased to call undiscovered places think of their discoverers? The famous lines about—

> stout Cortez, when with eagle eyes
> He stared at the Pacific—and all his men
> Look'd at each other with a wild surmise—
> Silent upon a peak in Darien,

cannot, without lapsing into the Pathetic Fallacy, be used in this connection. But, quite apart from the Pacific Ocean, Cortez had just discovered Mexico. What did the Mexicans think about him? How did the inhabitants of Guanahani (Watling Island) take the arrival of Columbus? Did they, as has been suggested, shift their chewing-gum from one cheek to the other, and observe: "Say, boys, we are discovered"? Or, to take a more serious example, what would we not give to possess the minute-book of the Parochial Church Council at Corinth (see Index *s.v.* "Correspondence, Apostolic," A.U.C., *circa* 808). Even without that, it would immensely increase our under-

standing of St. Paul if we could know something of the reaction of those to whom such letters as 1 and 2 Corinthians or Galatians were addressed.

These reflections have been induced by the reading of a profoundly interesting book, *Ven. Dominic Barberi in England*, by Father Urban Young, C.P. (Burns Oates, 6s.). Here is some history from the other end. Newman, on October 8, 1845, wrote to several of his friends: "I am this night expecting Father Dominic, the Passionist, who from his youth has been led to have distinct and direct thoughts, first of the countries of the North, then of England. After thirty years' (almost) waiting, he was without his own act sent here. . . . He is a simple, holy man, and withal gifted with remarkable powers. He does not know of my intention; but I mean to ask of him admission to the One Fold of Christ." The book, which is a selection from Father Dominic's letters, written while he was in England, most generously bears out the testimony contained in Newman's tribute, and much more. Among other things, it makes clear that Dominic for nearly thirty years was utterly persuaded, with no apparent probability that the idea could ever ripen into fact, that his vocation summoned him to revive the Passionist life in England and to be an instrument in the conversion of the English people. His first visit was in 1840, and in May of the following year he addressed in the *Universe* an Open Letter to "the professors of the University of Oxford." What is described in the book as his sympathetic treatment of the questions which were then vexing some of those who had been till lately of the Tractarian school, led to correspondence (in Latin and French), and to an intimate acquaintance with Dalgairns. He visited Littlemore in June, 1844, "to see the new monastery of Anglican 'monks,' and was received with every token of cordiality and sincere regard by Dr. Newman, the founder, and by his disciples." In December he writes: "Dr. Newman is not the head of the University, but of a Religious House near Oxford. Many vague rumours are flying about concerning him and his possible movements. I am full of hope, and keep up continual correspondence by letter with the said house at Littlemore. The obstacles in their path are very great." It is interesting to note that six months later an English bishop wrote: "The adherents of Mr. Newman are few in number. A short time will now probably suffice to prove this fact. It is well known that he is preparing for secession; and, when that event takes place, it will be seen how few will go with him."

The events of October 8 and 9, 1845, are thus told by Father Dominic: "I reached Littlemore about an hour before midnight, and I took up my position before the fire to dry myself. The door opened—and what a spectacle it was for me to see at my feet John Henry Newman begging me to hear his confession and admit him into the bosom of the Catholic Church! And there by the fire he began his general confession with extraordinary humility and devotion. In the morning I betook myself to Oxford to say Mass in a Catholic Church there, and returned to Littlemore once more amid pouring rain. There I terminated Mr. Newman's confession, and then heard the confessions of two other gentlemen who were there, namely, Revs. Stanton and Bowles, both of them, like Newman, ministers of the Church of England. That same evening, about six o'clock, I received the profession of faith of all three, and gave them conditional baptism. On the following morning, the Feast of St. Francis Borgia, I said Holy Mass for the first time in their private oratory. I had previously borrowed all that was necessary from a good priest in the neighbourhood. At the Mass I gave Holy Communion to Mr. Newman and four other companions of his, formerly Protestants, and now most fervent Catholics. . . . Newman has been up to now what I might term the Pope of the Protestants, their oracle, the soul of the Puseyite party, which is the most widely diffused in the Church of England and embraces all that is most serious and devout in the Protestant Church. He is reputed to be the most learned ecclesiastic in England. In my judgment he is one of the most humble and lovable men I have met in my life. Let us hope that the results of such conversions may be incalculable."

For the rest, the book is a remarkable chronicle of simple goodness and unconquerable simple faith. Passages like this abound: "We have no debts, and there is a small sum for current expenses. What more do we want? There are five of us, and God provides for five. If there were fifty in Community, I am sure that the same thing would happen." "Postal expenses are dear here, and I cannot write so often. I have every hope that nothing will be wanting for our maintenance. The funds at the disposal of Providence are great. Providence will never go bankrupt." "Our chapel at Aston threatens to fall, and another must be built, and God will see to this also. Let us, one and all, pray hard for England." "For thirty years I prepared myself to suffer in England, and I am bound to admit that my sufferings have far surpassed anything that I could have expected. And what am I to expect for the future? Crosses—

and still more crosses. And of what kind? I do not know, and I do not care to know; God will support me. My paper is done, and I finish too with an earnest request for the prayers of all." Behind this simple expression of unfailing confidence was a life given wholly to prayer and labour, an unending tale of service in the founding and nursing of infant communities and incessant retreats, missions, confessions and interviews, during the whole of which he was sustained by a burning faith. In the last month of his life he writes: "I drag myself along as best I can and take no rest. Repose is not part of the Passionist life in the world, above all for Father Dominic! I must hasten my return to England." He died in a railway train at Pangbourne on August 27, 1849. There were by that time three Passionist houses in England, containing twenty-eight Religious, of whom eleven were already priests. It had been suggested that the habit should not be worn in England, but Dominic faced all opprobrium, and preached always "exactly as in Italy," in the habit, with sandalled feet and the crucifix on his breast.

His missions had remarkable success. He caused at first intense alarm in Staffordshire. "They preach in their churches at the same hour as I do, to keep people from coming to hear me. They have started house to house visiting, with the sole object of exhorting the people not to come to me. They have opened a new church close to ours and placed a new minister in charge. . . . I hear that they are afraid and have some idea that I am a very learned person." At a Corpus Christi procession in 1844, "with all possible splendour—triumphal arches, altars, and a sermon preached out of doors," there was an attendance of over a thousand, of whom half were strangers. This by itself is not much, but it is certain that he received very many into the fold. Thus, in May, 1842: "Since Good Friday I have received seven persons into the Church, and, had I nothing else to do, I might possibly receive from four to five hundred converts a year." Who were these people? A few were like Mr. Leigh, a Gloucestershire landowner, but for the most part "they are very ignorant. One has to begin by making them understand that there is one God in three distinct Persons. They have no objections to bring forward, as a rule. The real obstacles to be overcome are the extreme ignorance and even indifference to their salvation which they display." "To make Catholics is not easy, for the good reason that they have to be made Christians first, and that is precisely the difficulty. . . . Insults and mockery of every description are our lot, and conversions are few. Never mind! We must

await the hour of the divine mercy. . . . I do what I can, but find English difficult, above all preaching in the language."

He had a great admiration for the English. "Send a few more good men ready to suffer, to be mocked and despised for the love of our Lord and His Church in this land. Consider that if we win England for the Faith it would mean the sure and certain expansion of our holy religion throughout the world. English influence, English energy and might, far surpass that of any other nation. Besides, the nation is already so accomplished in every way that the one thing that it lacks to become the finest nation in the world is the possession of the Catholic faith." As everyone knows, these hopes were not wholly fulfilled. Shortly before Newman's secession he was anticipating it and saying: "These conversions will give a terrible blow to the Church of England! I hear that thousands of people are disposed to take the same step, so that apparently the Puseyite movement will end well. There is much to be hoped for." Shortly after it he is found writing: "Let me say something about the state of England. When will it come back to the bosom of the Church? Perhaps, away yonder, you think it may be soon. For my part, I do not think so. God can do what He wills, but, humanly speaking, I see no prospect of the total conversion of England *in globo*. There are too many passions, too many prejudices, too much egoism, too much indifference."

It was a devoted and beautiful life. Cardinal Bourne calls him "worthy indeed of our honour and of our private prayers and veneration, pending the hour when the Church may authoritatively set him publicly among her Saints." His lifelong conviction and the degree of success which he attained and did not attain seem to illustrate a very ancient and just principle, namely, that guidance is a real thing, to be listened to, and respected, and obeyed, but that a sure conclusion about the truth of it will not appear till long afterwards. Just as the test of œcumenicity is subsequent acceptance by the whole body of the faithful, so it may be said that time enough has passed since 1840 to make it clear that it was the will of God that Father Dominic should come to England, and work as he did, and have the measure of success that he had. But the future was not to be exactly as he anticipated; the will of God was not exactly as he desired. He never really understood the Church of England. How could he be expected to do so,

when few of her own members did? And the letters of Dalgairns, while they aroused the good man's sympathy, did not elicit from him that mysterious, supernatural sympathy, transcending personal, natural, domestic sympathies, without which no one ever can be a true apostle for reunion. There must always be something not only of "Help Thou mine unbelief," but of "Enlarge Thou my inherited belief." Dalgairns at an early period of the correspondence was writing: "Could it be right to quit the Anglican Church just at the moment when it is reviving? I quite allow that without a union with Christendom no good can come of the movement, however good and powerful it may seem at present. But the question is, by what steps God wills to bring about this union; and it seems to me that we should plainly overstep and anticipate God's providence if we quitted our present position till His will is clearly shewn. . . . We cannot look upon the Anglican Church quite in the light in which you view it." A year later he wrote: "You need not trouble yourself about our failure with regard to Dr. Symons [Warden of Wadham, one of the leaders in the degradation of W. G. Ward]. Those among us who have our eyes fixed on Rome care but little about such external things; we have never had any hope of influencing authorities in the Church of England, and were most of us averse to making the attempt." Encouraged by these letters, and discounting their qualifications as the natural hesitation of men before they take the plunge, how could he think in terms of the recovery of an unused Catholic inheritance, of the re-affirmation of the Catholic character of the Church of England, of the Prayer Book as a manual of Catholic worship? How could he be expected to do justice to things of which he was either unaware or incredulous? He could not foresee what has since come to pass. The influence which has in point of fact been exerted upon the Church of England as a whole and upon the authorities of it is not such as either he or Dalgairns could have desired to see. But it has been appreciable. And those who believe in being guided by the course of events as it is seen over a long period and a large area may take courage. The cause of reunion is as great as it ever was. But because proposals then made for absorption were resisted, reunion is much nearer than it was.

In one respect we cannot help thinking that Father Dominic does less than justice to the Church of England. He was an ascetic monk, and there was much worldliness in the Church of England at that time, but was it quite fair to say: "If any of us wanted to turn Protestant—which God forbid!—he would

be at once rewarded by the acquisition of a rich wife, a good house, and plenty of money. I know of an instance in point" ? And is it really true that the benefice of Brington in the diocese of Peterborough, resigned by the Rev. George Spencer, afterwards one of Father Dominic's Passionist priests, was worth £3,000 a year ? There is no doubt that Mr. Spencer gave up that income, because he says so. But it is probable that five-sixths of it was an allowance from the head of his family. There is one incident in the book to which there have been parallels elsewhere. "What is to be done ? It is all a great anxiety. If the Bishop stands firm I fear nothing, but if he gives in it is all over."

We regret that in the Warden of Keble's article in the August number there was a misprint, which had the effect of seriously obscuring the sense. On p. 75, line 4, "confirm" should be "complete." In line 5, "confirm" stands fast.

We do not know, and we have not enquired, to what portion of the Catholic Church one of the contributors to this number, Mr. Felix Hope, belongs. His words seem to be the uncontroversial expression of a desire which all may share.

THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN: AN ESCHATOLOGICAL STUDY

(Continued.)

IV

CONTEMPORARY criticism of the Synoptic Gospels is so intricate that a writer almost feels bound to write a book defining his position before making a contribution, however modest, to the debates. Fortunately no such proceeding is necessary in this case. The temptation to support the theory by claiming certain passages as authentic and rejecting others will be resisted.

For the purpose of this essay I assume that the words ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels come substantially from His lips, except in so far as variations in the parallel accounts compel a different conclusion. Conservatively minded readers will not take this amiss and those on the other wing can make the necessary adjustments for themselves. The eschatological positions held or presupposed in the passages quoted are either those of Jesus and His followers, or else they were held by His followers so confidently that it was plausible to assign them to Jesus, since there was no consciousness of deviating from Him on this score. I do not intend to argue with those who hold that "Son of Man" was never used by Jesus of Himself, a theory which makes such havoc of the records that we are reduced to almost complete scepticism as to the possibility of accurate knowledge about Jesus. However, I think that the early Christians only partially understood His teaching; the different versions of His words in the Synoptic Gospels show their perplexity.

I assume that Jesus used the symbolical language of the day wherewith to express His convictions about His nature and mission, but that He transcended it. This hardly needs arguing.* Less generally accepted will be the contention that the early Church well understood what was meant by the language of symbolism. The writer of the Fourth Gospel, who so wonderfully transmuted primitive eschatology, must have spoken for as well as to many like-minded persons, and those who appreciated St. Paul's doctrine of "the heavenlies" in Ephesians will hardly have construed "heaven" in a physical sense. There must have been many naive believers who did not think out difficulties, but even in their case, could we have an opportunity of explaining what we mean by symbolic language, I have little

* As we have seen, there were two schools of eschatological thought; only the transcendental view is represented in the teaching of Jesus.

doubt they would say: That is just what we meant, though we did not express it like that.*

The relevant passages will now be discussed.

(*a*) *St. Mark*, with the variations introduced by St. Matthew and St. Luke. Mark viii. 38, ix. 1: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they shall see the Kingdom of God come with power." The scene is laid in heaven, as in Luke xii. 8, 9: "Whosoever shall confess (deny) me before men, him shall the Son of Man confess (deny) before the angels of God." The coming is that of Daniel vii., the Son of Man being brought to the Father with the holy ones. "The coming of the Kingdom with power" means the same thing, namely, the vindication of Jesus as in Mark xiv. 62.

Matthew xvi. 27, 28 virtually repeats Mark except for the final words: "till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."

Luke ix. 26, 27 misses the point from lack of Jewish knowledge or from the necessity of adapting Mark for Gentile readers. ". . . when he cometh in his own glory, and the glory of the Father, and of the holy angels." This is hard to credit to Jesus: His own glory comes first, the Father's second, thirdly, and co-ordinated with the other two, that of the angels. "Till they see the Kingdom of God" tones down the eschatology.

Mark x. 37: James and John say: "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory." This refers not to the Messianic banquet† but to the heavenly thrones of judgment in the Danielic sense, and as in Matt. xix. 28. Matt. xx. 21 has "kingdom" for "glory."

Mark xiii. 26, 27: "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then shall he send forth his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven." This is often taken to be an apocalyptic utterance referring to an unidentified Son of Man, which was transferred to Jesus. But on His lips it is consistent with our theory. The Son of Man comes to the Father and the angels gather the elect to Him, as in Thessalonians.

Matthew xxiv. 30: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth

* No attempt will be made to distinguish the types of eschatology which may be thought to prevail in the four Synoptic sources—Mark, Q, M, L.

† To which the technical term "glory" is less appropriate.

mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send forth his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to another." "The sign of the Son of Man" is difficult. Some have thought that a confusion between the Hebrew *ĕth* (the mark of the accusative) and *ōth* ("sign") lies behind the variation. Others that a cross appearing in heaven is meant as in the Gospel of Peter x. 40.* If Matthew has preserved the essential features of Mark, in xxiv. 3 he has added "what shall be the sign *of thy coming* (*parousia*)?" which may be taken of a return to the present earth.

Luke xx. 27 shortens considerably: "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." The substitution of "cloud" for "clouds" suggests that Luke has failed to see the meaning of the Old Testament imagery.

Mark xiv. 61, 62: "Again the high priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus saith, I am: and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." Apparently "Son of God," or (avoiding the word "God") "Son of the Blessed," was not a current Jewish title for the Messiah; but, as we have seen, it is used of him in the Psalms. In any case we have the question "Art thou the Christ?" and, whether or no the high priest added "the Son of the Blessed," it is implied. Jesus in replying "I am" makes the fullest possible claim to Messiahship. He is the Christ, the Davidic Priest-King of Psalm cx., who was bidden sit at God's right hand: He is also the Danielic Son of Man. The two titles are equated, both being dependent on "see," which is most naturally taken as referring to the same kind of seeing in each case. The meaning is: Ye shall see Me, the Christ, the Son of Man, the "Son of God" of the Psalms, exalted to the right hand of God, brought there on the clouds of heaven. If it were not for other passages of the New Testament, and the Church's belief in the Second Coming, the ordinary interpretation of the passage would not stand; a highly symbolical utterance derived from Daniel would inevitably be completed by adding the missing words of the Daniel passage.

Then as regards intrinsic probability. The time was one of intense mental as well as physical suffering. Jesus had sustained the ordeals of the Last Supper, Gethsemane, the Arrest and the Trial. As we learn from the story of Gethsemane, union with

* M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 92; *cf. Didache* xvi. 6.

the Father's will was His overmastering impulse and motive. When He at last broke the silence, His words betrayed the inner emotion. "I am the Christ: I shall soon be vindicated. I shall be received by My Father to the place of honour. And this My exaltation and vindication you shall know." It was in no sense a theological statement but a confession of faith, so appropriate on the lips of Jesus that we may believe He spoke thus, that the words were treasured by friendly members of the Sanhedrin, if not heard and remembered by St. Peter; even perhaps that they were recorded in the archives as the final condemnation of a deluded fanatic. That the confession of faith was justified is essential to the Christian faith, but such strange symbolical words would lend themselves to misunderstanding, even among Christians.

The usual interpretation is intrinsically less probable. "Ye shall see the Son of Man first exalted and then returning in the clouds to judge the world." That is, Jesus looked forward to His exaltation to the Father, to a sojourn in heaven of an unspecified period, and to a return to earth with a view of accomplishing what He had failed to do this time. Is it not the improbability of such thoughts having filled His mind at this moment which has led critics to deny the authenticity of the words?

The parallel passages are:—

Matt. xxvi. 63, 64: ". . . whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power. and coming on the clouds of heaven." The changes are not important, except for the introduction of "henceforth" (ἀπ' ἄρτι). Elsewhere this means "from now onwards" (see John xiii. 19, xiv. 7). The latter passage is instructive: "from henceforth (ἀπ' ἄρτι) ye know him (the Father), and have seen him." On this analogy Matt. xxvi. 64 would suggest a continuing condition in the future and tell in favour of our theory rather than against. But the point of view may be that of later Christians expecting an immediate Parousia.

Luke xxii. 69, 70: "From henceforth (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) shall the Son of Man be seated at the right hand of the power of God. And they all said, Art thou then the Son of God . . ." "Henceforth" here as in Matthew means "from now onwards, some time in the future," the precise significance between determined by the context. Examples of St. Luke's use of ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν are Luke i. 48: "from henceforth all generations shall call me Blessed"; and v. 10: "from henceforth thou shalt catch men." All we can deduce from the addition is that Luke, like Matthew, felt the difficulty of the Markan passage. His other changes

are more significant. Nothing is left of the Danielic source except the phrase "Son of Man." Luke evidently means to show his Gentile readers that the Jewish Son of Man is the Son of God as understood by them.* The reason for the omission of "coming in the clouds of heaven" may be that he saw how inconsistent the popular explanation of it was with the preceding works in St. Mark.

(*b*) *St. Matthew* x. 23: "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come." A very difficult saying, perhaps meant of a return to this earth.

xiii. 41 (explanation of the Parable of the Tares): "The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity." He sends his angels and does not come himself. So in xiii. 49 (Parable of the Net): "the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous."

xix. 28: ". . . in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The scene is in heaven, where a throne is set for the Son of Man in glory, with thrones also for his assessors.

Luke xxii. 29, 30 has put the logion in a different context and, influenced by the associations of the Eucharistic feast, has introduced the idea of eating and drinking, which does not suit the use of seats as judgment thrones.† "I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may sit and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Matt. xxiv. 27: "As the lightning cometh forth from the east, and is seen even unto the west; so shall be the coming of the Son of Man." So also *v.* 39, of the Flood: "so shall be the coming of the Son of Man." Suddenness is indicated, and a sign in the sky in *v.* 27; nothing is said about a descent to earth.

Luke xvii. 24: "As the lightning . . . so shall the Son of Man be in his day"; *v.* 26: "And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man." The change to "in his day" does not seem to be significant.

Matt. xxv. 31: "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory. . . ." The imagery is derived from Daniel through

* In Luke xxiii. 47 Mark's "truly this was the Son of God" was altered to "certainly this was a righteous man," because Mark's phrase might convey too much.

† The descriptions of the Last Supper show the disciples reclining on couches.

Enoch. The throne is set in heaven. The nations are gathered to the Son of Man, who says to the righteous "Come, ye blessed" and to the wicked "Depart from me."

The Parables in St. Matthew which have Coming as their motive may be described as "parables of crisis." Their symbolical language throws no light on the manner in which Jesus understood His own future; but, as in Luke xviii. 8, the most natural reference on His lips is to the visitation of men by God during His ministry.

(c) *St. Luke.*

xii. 8: "Every one who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of Man also confess before the angels of God." The contrast is between earth and heaven. The angels are the assessors of the judgment held in heaven.

xii. 40: "Be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of Man cometh." If the Messianic secret had not been revealed, the coming is here the first coming, though the readers of the Gospel would naturally interpret it of the second coming.

xviii. 8: "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" This is most naturally taken of the one coming of the Enochian Son of Man, familiar to the disciples, who do not yet identify him with Jesus.

Postponing the Fourth Gospel for the present, we take the Acts next.

Acts i. 9: After walking with the disciples and conversing "he was taken up (ἀνελήμφθη); and a cloud received him out of their sight." So in 2 Kings ii. 11 Elijah, after walking and talking with Elisha, was taken up (ἀνελήμφθη) into heaven, in a chariot of fire with a whirlwind. Josephus (*Ant.* IV. 8. 48) also describes the end of Moses following a conversation with disciples: "As he greeted Eleazar and Joshua and continued talking with them, a cloud suddenly stood over him and he disappeared down a valley."

i. 11: "This Jesus, which was taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner* as ye beheld him going into heaven." The point of comparison is the cloud. Conceivably Luke's source represented Jesus brought in the clouds of heaven to the Father, as in our interpretation of Mark xiv. 62, and Luke as in the Passion narrative and Luke xx. 27 modified the difficult phrase, substituting the usual Old Testament imagery of the cloud for the Danielic *clouds*. If so, it is tempting to interpret his words in the light of the Elijah-story. "So" will then refer to the cloud, and the implied wind and fire, and the Coming of

* οὕτως . . . ὃν τρόπον. The same phrase occurs in xxvii. 25.

the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, with some of the accompaniments of a storm—rushing wind and celestial fire—will have been the fulfilment of the promise. Such exegesis, which seems revolutionary, merely involves holding that St. Luke, who in the Gospel modified the earliest eschatology a little, in the Acts anticipated John xiv. 16-18.*

Acts iii. 20, 21: "That he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things." At first sight this is unmistakable evidence for the ordinary view. But it is quite consistent with the eschatology of 1 Thessalonians, and with that of the Apocalypse, in which a new heaven and a new earth precede the return of Christ.

Acts vii. 56 (of Stephen): "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." This is based on Mark xiv. 62: "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of God," only "sitting" has become "standing," to indicate that Christ is actively intervening to help His servant.

V

The Epistles of St. Paul may be divided into four groups: (*a*) Thessalonians; (*b*) Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans; (*c*) the Captivity Epistles; (*d*) the Pastorals.

(*a*) 1 Thess. ii. 19: "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of glorying? Are not even ye, before our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?"

iii. 13: "At the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his holy ones."†

v. 2: "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night."

These passages throw no light on our problem.

1 Thess. iv. 16, 17: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up into the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

It is noteworthy that St. Paul, though using the traditional Son of Man eschatology, avoids the term "Son of Man," probably because Lord (*Kyrios*) was better suited to convey to Hellenistic readers the intended meaning. The use of "Lord" in an eschatological context would help the transferring of Old Testament

* That the account of Pentecost resembles the giving of the Law on Sinai as conceived by contemporary Judaism is well known.

† "Angels," *cf.* iv. 16; "saints" is improbable, see 2 Thess. i. 7.

language about "the Day of the Lord" to descriptions of the coming of Christ. The "Second *Man*, from heaven," of 1 Cor. xv. 47, is probably St. Paul's rendering of the Aramaic "Son of Man." In the present passage he is concerned with the problem of those who die before the end. The Lord will descend, a symbolical term implying welcome of both the dead in Christ and those still alive. They will be caught up into the clouds, like Elijah (and Enoch presumably), to meet the Lord Jesus there and to be ever with Him. There is no suggestion of Christ's coming down to tread this earth; if the imagery of Daniel was still potent, the clouds rather suggest that Christ and His own are brought to the Ancient of Days.

2 Thess. i. 7, 8: ". . . at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance . . . (10) when he shall come to be glorified in his Saints." A revelation (apocalypse) of the Lord is described, not a return to earth. In the light of the Danielic prototype of all such visions we take the scene to be laid in heaven, though "come" might seem to refer to a return to earth.

2 Thess. ii. 1: ". . . touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him." This "gathering together" (ἐπισυναγωγή) of the elect repeats the thought of 1 Thess. iv. and determines the sense of 2 Thess. i. 10.

(*b*) The relevant passages in the second group of Epistles are 1 Corinthians iv. 5: "Judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come"; xi. 26: "till he come"; xv. 23: "then they that are Christ's, at his coming." They are best interpreted in the light of 1 Thessalonians. Christ reigns at the right hand of God until He subdues all His enemies. The "coming" is followed immediately by the "end." The sense is apparently: ". . . his coming. Then at the end (when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God . . . For he must reign, *i.e.*, in heaven, till he hath put all enemies under his feet) the last enemy shall be destroyed, even death" (xv. 23-26).

(*c*) Here Philippians alone gives any information; iii. 20: "Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ," who will refashion our bodies; and iv. 5: "The Lord is at hand." Once more, nothing necessarily implies a descent to earth.

(*d*) 1 Timothy vi. 14, "until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ," and 2 Timothy iv. 1, "by his appearing, and his Kingdom," contribute nothing to our enquiry.

Jude 14 quotes Enoch: "The Lord (in the Old Testament sense, not Christ or the Son of Man) came with ten thousands

of his holy ones, to execute judgment . . .", adding nothing to our knowledge of distinctively Christian eschatology but showing the abiding influence of the Enochian scheme.

2 Peter iii. 4: "Where is the promise of his coming?" *v.* 10: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat, and the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up." The "coming" is identified with the destruction of the present earth and heaven, to be replaced by a new earth and heaven—a primitive eschatology lasting on into, probably, the second century and contrasting strongly with that of St. John's Gospel.

VI

The Fourth Gospel has a spiritualized eschatology, through which the original tradition may be discerned, with particular clearness in v. 25: "The hour cometh, *and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live . . . (*v.* 28): the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment." The words in italics show an attempt to make the future Parousia timeless.

vi. 50, 51: "This is the bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." The background of these verses, and of much else in the chapter, is the Eucharistic experience of the early Church. The coming down from heaven suggests that it was brought into relation with the Parousia.

xiv. 3: "I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." Here we seem to have the substance of the eschatology of Thessalonians; the coming, taken in connection with the receiving, is as far as the upper air only.

xiv. 19, 20: "Yet a little while (until Pentecost), and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me. . . . In that day (all that is left of Synoptic eschatology) ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." The Parousia is now identified with the coming of the Paraclete.

xvi. 16: "A little while, and ye behold me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see me"; *v.* 22: "I will see

you again"; *v.* 28: "I leave the world, and go unto the Father." Nothing is said about any return in the usually accepted sense.

xxi. 16: "If I will that he tarry till I come"; this does not define the manner of coming.

1 John ii. 28: "That, if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." *Cf.* Luke ix. 26, where the Son of Man at His coming is ashamed of the faithless.

How St. John conceived the coming of Christ is perhaps suggested by 1 John iv. 3, where "antichrist . . . cometh; and now it is in the world already."

The Revelation of St. John is eschatological throughout and a detailed study would take up too much space here. A brief Summary is sufficient to show that the position maintained in this essay is confirmed.

i. 7: "Behold, he cometh with the clouds; and every eye shall see him . . ." is the primitive eschatology, based upon Daniel.* A throne is set in heaven, with twenty-four thrones around it for the assessors of the judgment (iv. 2, 4). The elect are sealed and transported to heaven (vii.). The two witnesses go up to heaven in a cloud,† as did Jesus, Moses (according to Josephus), and Elijah (presumably). Angels descend to earth frequently as God's agents, but Christ remains in heaven; even in xix. 11-16 the warfare seems to be waged in the celestial realm. In xx. the martyrs and confessors reign with Christ in heaven for a thousand years. Next comes the final judgment, heaven and earth fleeing before Him that sits on the great white throne. Lastly we have the new heaven and the new earth, and the holy city descends from heaven. The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple, "and the lamp thereof is the Lamb." Following all this we read: "I come quickly. Amen; come, Lord Jesus" (xxii. 20), and cannot doubt that for the writer the coming of Christ is the final coming, subsequent to the creation of the new heaven and the new earth, though, as we learn from iii. 20, the idea of the mystical coming in the life of the Church, probably with special reference to the Eucharist, was as congenial to him as to the Fourth Evangelist. "If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me."

One writer outside the limits of the New Testament will suffice for our purpose, Justin Martyr. In *Apology* li. 8, 9 we

* In i. 4, 8, iv. 8, God is He that cometh (ὁ ἐρχόμενος).

† xi. 12, a good example of the primitive theology of the Apocalypse.

read: "And that He is to come with glory from heaven, hear what was said to this effect by Jeremiah* the prophet, as follows: Behold one like a Son of Man comes on the clouds of heaven, and his angels with him." A study of the Concordance shows us that, apart from the Thessalonians, where the passages do not necessarily imply a descent to earth, there are no examples in the New Testament of "*from* heaven" referring to Christ's return.† The Holy Spirit comes from heaven, so do angels, but not Christ, except as the Light of the heavenly Jerusalem. That Justin's words are to be taken as bearing the traditional meaning is proved by the *Dialogue against Trypho*, xiv. 8: "The first parousia of Christ. . . . His second parousia, when He shall come with glory and on the clouds and your people shall see and recognize Him whom they pierced."‡

In the foregoing study no attempt has been made to be judicial. I have thought it best to show, if possible, that practically the whole of the New Testament evidence *can* be interpreted so as to support my theory. I do not maintain that my interpretation is always the best one. Indeed, if the traditional view was firmly established in the second century, we should expect the New Testament to show traces of it. To write the history of the change of view, with a detailed exegesis of the individual passages, a book would be necessary rather than an essay.

VII

I will now try to draw conclusions from the discussion.

During the Maccabæan struggle an unknown genius formulated a doctrine of immense religious importance. Over against the secular empires known to him, which employed the methods of the jungle and were fitly symbolized by beasts, he conceived the idea of an empire of humanity, or rather of the pious section of the chosen people, for whom God designed power in the future. They were persecuted now, but in the timeless sphere the symbolic figure which stood for them was already brought before God the ruler of all and invested with royal dignity. That figure was as it were a Man (in Aramaic idiom Son of Man). Later speculation developed the idea and it was believed that the Son of Man would descend to earth and rule as vicegerent of the Most High. This supernatural and celestial figure was angelic in some respects, but bore the title Man. So it was an easy step to identify him with the Primal Man of Jewish speculation and describe his coming as a return.

At the beginning of our era Messianic expectation was sharp-

* *I.e.*, Daniel.

† John iii. 31, vi. 38; 1 Cor. xv. 47 refer to the first coming.

‡ *Cf.* also *Dial.* xxxi. 1, cxx. 4.

ened, since the Roman rule, justly regarded as oppressive even though exercised through "native princes," recalled the conditions of Maccabæan times. The Davidic King and the celestial Son of Man were the typical figures of two schools of eschatology. In the mind of Jesus the Davidic King of the Psalms and the Son of Man of Daniel coalesced, but the Son of Man concept predominated and only such features of the King were chosen as were consistent with it. To them Jesus added the Isaianic figure of the Suffering Servant, and applied the whole to Himself. All that was written of the Son of Man would be fulfilled, but—and this was the movement of thought which changed the world—only through suffering culminating in death would He achieve world dominion. At the supreme moment of the Passion, we may believe, the *religious* issue was paramount. Vindication by the Father, at His own time and in His own way, was the faith which filled the mind of Jesus. There is no evidence that He believed He would return to a world still existing in the same conditions.

The first Christians understood the Messianic sayings in the same way. The end would come shortly, when the elect, like Enoch, Elijah and Moses, would be caught up into heaven to reign with the Lord Jesus. But this belief by itself did not do justice to the complex of ideas connected with the Son of Man—Messiah in Jewish tradition. Only to a limited extent had prophecy been fulfilled in the historic Jesus, so fulfilment in the full sense had to be put forward into the future. Judgment was committed to the Son of Man, who would exercise it in heaven, where His throne was set. He would banish all evil from His face, consigning it to the everlasting fire. Then a new heaven (for heaven needed purifying as well as earth) and a new earth would be created, and heaven would descend to earth; or, as we should say, the distinction between heaven and earth would cease to exist.

Eventually, however, another line of thought prevailed. The *return* of the Messiah to earth was expected. What had originally described the (first) coming or return of the Primal Man was transferred to the second coming to earth of Jesus; by the time of Justin the transformation was complete. How far the new conception appears in the New Testament is doubtful. St. Paul, early Synoptic tradition, and the Apocalypse provide evidence for my view. It may be conjectured that St. Luke was puzzled by the Jewish symbolical language and that his interpretation of eschatology contributed to the change. St. Matthew also seems to provide evidence for the new interpretation. St. John witnesses to another mode of thought, in which the coming of Christ as Paraclete is of central importance.

VIII

What is left of the Church's faith that "He shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead"? Clearly this article of the Creed is necessarily symbolic; also the Church merely intends to summarize the teaching of Our Lord on the subject—if it assumes a different aspect, then the interpretation of the Creed follows suit. Already the traditional views have been largely abandoned even by the orthodox, who are generally unable to put forward any alternative which does justice to the teaching of the New Testament. I am therefore led to state my own provisional belief regarding the Second Coming.*

The continual coming of Christ in the Johannine sense—in the Comforter, in the Eucharist, in the dialogue of the soul with God†—satisfies all ordinary needs. What was central for St. John cannot be regarded as a minimizing doctrine today. Especially in the Eucharist do I find the spiritualization of primitive eschatology. The resemblance of the opening words of the Canon to St. Paul's description in Thessalonians is remarkable. "Lift up your hearts. We lift them up unto the Lord"—"We shall be caught up to meet the Lord."‡ "With angels and archangels"—the angels of the parousia, "with the voice of the archangel." We cry "blessed is He that cometh"—"we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord," who "shall descend from heaven with a shout." "Hosanna in *the Highest*"—so the saints in Thessalonians "meet the Lord in the air." And then in the liturgy the Son of Man brings all His mystical body to the Ancient of Days, and His redeeming acts in history are recalled and re-enacted.§

Satisfies all ordinary needs, I said. But deeper needs remain, which cannot be satisfied by any form of religious experience possible on earth. The City of God claims our attention and

* Great caution is clearly necessary. The position here advocated is not "my view"; I should only label it as such if it succeeded in convincing other scholars. For the present I must reckon with the possibility of "rationalization"; that I am making up ingenious reasons to support what I should like to be true.

† As in the walk to Emmaus.

‡ The *Sursum* is apparently based on Lam. iii. 41: "Let us lift up our heart with our hands unto God in the heavens." Why an obscure verse in the Old Testament should have had such an influence is hard to explain apart from the eschatological language of the New Testament.

§ With unintentional felicity the Anglican rite introduces the Canon with "Comfortable Words," as St. Paul ends his passage with "wherefore comfort one another with these words" (1 Thess. iv. 18). Note also the part played by "the dead in Christ" in the Liturgies. The "myriads" of Dan. vii. 10 and Jude 14 recur in the Sanctus of the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions; this suggests a Eucharistic-Parousia background in Heb. xii. 22: "Ye are come unto the heavenly Jerusalem, and unto *myriads of angels*."

we know that all is not well. "Why should not my countenance be sad, when the city lieth waste?" We require to be assured that our cause will be vindicated, that humanity and not the law of the jungle will prevail, that the way of Jesus is the way of God, that at long last the counsels of God which we have tried to discern and follow will be declared good and true. Not otherwise can the yearnings of the thoughtful among men be satisfied. Here we find common ground with many who are not Christians in the full sense. They are as distressed as we by the predominance of the beasts, as Daniel described the pagan states of his time, and, if they have not abandoned hope, both hope and believe in the final vindication of the ideals of sacrifice and service. But for Christians the vague outlines of such a creed are filled in. The final vindication of God's ways is inseparable from the figure of the Jesus Christ, both of history and experience, whom they know. That by which all human activities and values will be judged is the Lord who already comes to them in Eucharist and prayer.

Need we go further than this? Ought we to go further, when Christ has told us that of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the Son? We may think a gradual running down of the world the most likely manner of the end, or we may prefer to think of a catastrophic termination such as the New Testament teaches—either is legitimate in view of the declaration of Christ. And reverent thought regarding the how and when of the end is profitable. Let me conclude with the suggestion that St. John has penetrated most deeply into the mystery of the Second Coming, and that the final revelation of Christ will prove to be in line with our experience here; that the final Parousia (presence and coming) will be an intensification of what the communicant already enjoys at the Eucharist.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

LITURGY AND PRAYER

One of the most cheering signs of the Second Spring is the reviving devotion to the Church's worship and the kindling zest on the part of the faithful for that share in the great treasure of the Liturgy which is ours by right.

Englishmen are inclined to be insular, but Catholics have little cause to be. From Rome comes our Faith, from Rome our civilisation, from Rome our Liturgy. The glories of Catholic England ended just as the acute consciousness of nationality grew up to remould Europe, and in these latter

days to devastate it. Our holy religion knows no frontiers, and the strength to conquer England for Christ will grow proportionately with the consciousness of this. Few things can so strengthen this most wholesome awareness of our unity in Faith and worship with the faithful of every nation and of every tongue as the sacred Liturgy, wherein all join to offer up to God the same most acceptable worship.

Nowadays we are almost deafened with cries of "Reconstruction," and in no department of life is the demand more pressing than in that of religion, since, whether events prove that the war has made people more religious or not, it is already evident that it has caused many to give new and serious attention to the subject. Of course, for Catholics no religious reconstruction is necessary, our spiritual edifice having been constructed nearly two thousand years ago on a rock-foundation warranted to resist greater shocks than even a world-war, but other religious bodies have been less fortunate, and the air is full of schemes for the creation of new religions and new deities, or for the remodelling of existing religious systems, so that they may retain the restless and perplexed among their adherents, and attract those without their pale.

In the spiritual life, as in all other intelligent undertakings, it is essential to begin by seeing things as whole and at least in a general way the relation of part to part and part to whole. There is a wrong and right way of doing most things, in church as well as out of it, and when an action has to be performed one may well learn the most convenient way of doing it.

In the Printed Epistle of the Society of Friends, issued in the year 1885, there is a sentence which contains much truth and much wisdom. "Pure worship under the Gospel," says the Quaker document, "stands neither in forms nor in the formal disuse of forms." The use of the word "formal" in that context implies an adroit mind and an exact pen. Devotion, if it is to be reasonable, must be founded on what you believe, else it is only sentiment.

Orthodoxy, we are told, is the "faith once delivered unto the Saints." It is not mere obscurantism, not a mere mental hysteresis, not the empty lack of thought of the less enlightened or the more axe-grinding portion of the community. At a time when the absolute things have dwindled and dwindled under the baleful influence of scientific and agnostic relativism, it is good indeed to hear that orthodoxy has seen it through, and that it is coming more and more into prominence as the destructive and thoughtless iconoclasm of the "moderns" is progressively seen to have cleared the vision by leaving little else standing. The defenders of Christian orthodoxy stand

four-square on the imperishable basis of a rational and coherent philosophy. Because they defend a city—a city not made with hands alone, a City of God—and because their enemies have been able to choose what direction, what form, what discipline they have liked, the ceaseless waves of attack have at times seemed to overwhelm the fortress. But because of their very heterogeneity these enemies must needs always fail.

"The sacred Liturgy of the Church in those days, when it was fully understood by the people, took the place of our pictures, statues and illustrated catechisms, nor was the religious instruction then imparted less profound, as is shown by the inspired defence made before the pagan tribunals by some of the early martyrs." So, to know *why* a particular Gospel is found in a particular Mass—*why* a certain Saint is mentioned in the prayers on a certain day—to have at the back of the mind a picture of the Roman Christians in procession or preparing their catechumens for baptism—all these things must make the following of the Missal prayers day by day a truly strengthening and enriching task, quite apart from the purely spiritual benefit acquired. And how can that spiritual gain fail to be increased by added interest and attention, and knowledge of the human history of the Mass?

It is easy enough, however, to scoff at the Anglican clergyman carrying English notions of worship into the torrid zones of the earth. Superior people may smile at his gleaming Roman collar, and make merry over the Western type of ecclesiastical architecture which he has intruded into Africa or Asia. Though every kindred, nation or tongue throughout the whole earth has its contribution to make to the fullness and splendour of the Christian religion. "In the early days of missionary work in a non-Christian country, the first impressions are of the contrast between heathen and Christian, in faith and in worship: the task has seemed to be that of bringing light into darkness, rescuing souls for Christ from the clutches of false gods. The first converts, approached in this spirit, have had the same feelings; they have cut themselves off from the past, and joined with their teachers in a new life. There is a great gulf set between the two. In the sphere of worship, the early missionaries, knowing little of the worship of the people to whom they have come, and finding that little bad, have perforce used the Western form familiar to themselves, and have taught these to their converts."

The Church's discipline is no more invariable than is her Liturgy. She has the power to adapt either to changed circumstances of time or of place, and yet remains ever the same in the midst of such changes. For when modifications are

brought about in ecclesiastical discipline, it is always in a certain direction recognized to be in keeping with her own essential principles. It is this that constitutes the principle itself of tradition.

There is no class of people, no kind of temperament, for which the Church has not made provision, according to the needs of the times. From the beginning of the Middle Ages to the end of feudal times she worked chiefly through the instrumentality of the Benedictines and their various branches; from the spread of democracy at the beginning of the thirteenth century through the Mendicant friars; and at the period of the bourgeoisie through St. Francis of Sales. But we must not forget that the purpose of the Canonist Office is in the first line the public praise and worship of God, and only in the second place our personal devotion and edification. No doubt the more of this latter we reap, the more reasonable and worthy will our praise and worship be.

The Liturgy has a sense-image value for every person participating which stirs the latent emotions of the worshipper and so evolves intercommunication between Creator and creature. In other words, "Liturgy is to religion what the word is to thought; it is a mirror in which all should see truths of the supernatural order, just as they see truths of a natural order in the visible world. History shows the truth of this; for in the Ages of Faith the number of Holidays of Obligation were about equal to that of Sundays. Twice a week then, at least, there was the uplifting cultural influence of this congregational singing of the Liturgy; and the effects of this influence are obvious on considering the conditions of that time. To quote Peter Maurin on the same point: 'People who built the Cathedral of Chartres knew how to combine cult, that is to say liturgy, with culture, that is to say philosophy, and cultivation, that is to say agriculture.' If the word sociology is substituted for philosophy the fitness of this dictum can be appreciated to the full."

No country in the whole world has such an elaborate etiquette of the dining table as England. Special garments must be worn. Special phrases must be used. The meal is opened, like a solemn religious function, with a procession. We may not move our head or our hands except by law appointed. The very meats we eat and wines we drink are a law of the Medes and Persians. Nay, the very order of taking them may hardly be broken; and unless a man would be a social outcast he dare not transpose the items of the menu. To crown it all, in this same menu we have even the strange phenomenon of a ritual language not "understanded of the people." Now that

the nation has largely given up evensong and evening prayer, its appetite for ritual has become identified with its appetite for food. The chief liturgical act of the day is no longer the morning sacrifice, but the evening meal.

All this can be quite mistakenly condemned. It is not all in vain; nor vain at all except in so far as it supplants what is of greater worth and duty. The worst of it is merely a misplaced instinct for what is divine. Imagine what a meal would be if men and women sat down at a well-spread table with no other intent than to consume as much as they could as quickly as they could! The action of taking food is of itself so gross and humiliating that a meal without manners would be an unendurable orgy.

Table manners prevents the animal within us having its way. Thereby it unchains the mind. What meal unguarded by formality would give room for intelligent talk? Yet it is mostly at the evening meal that the family meet face to face; and talk is the better fare. The evening meal is thus the one common act of the household. Unless sanctified by ritual it would be a mere carrying out in public of acts better done in private. But as it is the one common act of the day it is only less holy than a common prayer; and if it is not a sacrifice it can come near being a sacrament.

Lastly, it is more than likely that those who prefer hills and the sea to a formal house of prayer are really misinterpreting the whole idea of prayer. Even private prayer is not a mere self-satisfying thought about beautiful things. It can be a very harrowing thought and effort over disagreeable things. The end of prayer is not spiritual satisfaction but Spiritual Strength.

Now, a man's whole soul may be braced up by a fatiguing ceremony which leaves him almost fainting; and a man's whole soul may be undermined by a walk in the hills which has braced up his fatigued body.

Dr. Johnson in his journey to the western Highlands discovered several things that strengthened his sympathy with the "old religion." "Through the new islands which we visited we neither saw nor heard of any house of prayer, except in Skye, that was not in ruins." Ceremony and decency, he affirmed, had been blasted together; and he added this pregnant remark for the consideration of those who think that a beautiful and profound Liturgy is necessarily associated with lazy and mechanical devotions: "Over the sleepy laziness of our last erected churches, we may indulge our superiority with a triumph, by comparing it with the fervid activity of those who suffer them to fall."

There is a type of mind that delights in the intricacies of ceremonial, and is better pleased the more intricate they are. It is not peculiar to ecclesiastical circles. A Byzantine emperor like Constantine Porphyrogenitus is afflicted by it no less than a Papal master of ceremonies like Caietan or Amelli, or the English author of the *Crede Michi;* and the correct dress of an English Judge is as difficult a point to settle as that of a cardinal of the Church. There is also a rival type of mind which neglects the decencies and orderliness of a function, and is impatient of the regulation and trouble which are needful to secure them. Persons of the latter type are not disposed to write directories of ceremonial; there is therefore no need to curb them in this respect, but rather to compel them to study such books when good ones are available. Persons of the former type, however, are eagerly disposed in this direction; but they should be dissuaded from the congenial task, or even restrained. For the person who can be trusted to write such books is one whose temperament lies midway between the extremes.

Many of those who still linger outside the Catholic Church though on its threshold, find in our riches of ritual a means of deepening those convictions which keep them where they are. When they have been present at a High Mass or a feast-day Benediction they say, perhaps regretfully: "Give me a simple service. This elaborate ceremonial does not help my soul towards God. The incense, the lights, the bowings and processions merely withdraw my soul from its centre and stifle the voice of a prayer. Bear with me when I say that I can pray best when away from your elaborate ceremonial and hidden in my own room, or best of all in the great silences within the hills or within hearing of the noble music of the sea."

A number of things have to be settled before a satisfying answer can be made to this regret.

The speaker must determine with himself how much, if any, of his distaste is but an overflow into the sphere of external worship of his innate distaste for doing anything under command. To enter the Kingdom of Heaven as a little child demands a measure of self-surrender which baulks many minds. Perhaps it is almost too much to expect from minds of every type the childlike self-surrender needed by each unit in a collective and external prayer.

Again, in preferring the hills or the seaside to a church as a place of prayer the speaker may be giving voice to a very natural sanitary instinct. He may be fixing the name of a spiritual judgment to the natural pleasure a healthy man feels

in exchanging the overheated or under-ventilated air of a room for the winds from the heather or the surf. None are likely to part company with him on this point; and especially no priests, whose lives are often shortened by long hours in the foul air of a place of public worship.

Moreover, it has to be determined by the speaker how much of his distaste for a ritual of prayer is not a misinterpretation of life. Pascal has written: "C'est être superstitieux de mettre son espérance dans les formalités et dans les cérémonies; mais c'est être superbe de ne pas vouloir s'y soumettre." We may translate and paraphrase this fine thought of Pascal thus: "It is superstition to look on ceremonies as an end; it is pride to deny they are a means." To refuse ritual is to deny oneself.

What, for instance, can be imagined more formal or, if the word may pass, more ritualistic than our meals? In every leisured and well-ordered house there is always at least one meal surrounded by as much formality as a royal reception.

In the chapter (the twenty-second of *Marius*) in which Walter Pater deals with the ritual of the early Church he describes its most profoundly beautiful drama, before which, in language and intellectual depth, the tragedies of ancient Greece are no more than nursery charades; and he recognizes the virtue—so often imputed as a fault—in the method of its development.

Wisdom, he says, in this Catholic Liturgy was dealing with the dust of outworn creeds and philosophies, and, like the spirit of life itself, organizing soul and body out of the lime and clay of the earth. "She gathers and serviceably adopts one thing here, another there, from various sources—Gnostic, Jewish, Pagan—to adorn and beautify the greatest act of worship the world has seen."

The average Christian seems to be the man or woman who generally goes to Mass on Sundays and feasts, keeps the Fridays and other days of abstinence and fasting (according to the interpretation which appears to have become fairly general), approaches the sacraments at Easter-time and perhaps on some of the greater feasts, keeps the Commandments without undue scrupulosity, and sends for the priest when in danger of death. Evidently there remains a very large margin.

The central point here is the witness of the Liturgy to the objectivity of Christ's redemptive work. It does not rest on subjective religious experience, but on the affirmation of faith, that the Gospel of God is true, and Christ has delivered us from the power of darkness and translated us into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Men are quite consciously going back to the early Church

for their models. No one can study the history of the Liturgy without seeing that the creative period was that of the early Church; the mediæval period, in spite of all its splendour of architecture and ceremonial, was a time when the Liturgy as a rite was decadent. The counter-Reformation still further lost the liturgical idea, and delighted in purely individual devotions, such as those to the Sacred Heart, aiming at the growth in piety of the individual soul. But the liturgical movement is going back to older and better models.

These men are trying to bring Catholics back to a deeper understanding of the Liturgy of the Mass; as one writer puts it, they deplore the concentration of attention on the Presence in the tabernacle, which can lead people to think of the Mass chiefly as the means by which the Real Presence is effected, and Communion as a special sort of visit to the Blessed Sacrament. Hence, Benediction is tolerated rather than encouraged; the stress is laid on the Mass and the Church's offering.

It is true that it seeks, as Dom Beauduin states, "to have the artists that are called to exercise a sacred art, architecture, painting, sculpture, etc., receive an education that will give them an understanding of the spirit and the rules of the Liturgy of the Church," and to "make known to artists and writers the fruitful inspiration to art that the Church offers in her Liturgy." But these things do not by any means constitute its primary end; it may rather be said that improvement in the arts used in the service of the Liturgy will result spontaneously when the spirit of the Liturgy has been better understood. Hence the aim to have the artists educated to a thorough understanding of this spirit. It is true, too, that a more intimate participation of the faithful in the liturgical services by some form of the *Missa recitata* and by congregational singing is an aim of the Liturgical Movement. At least as far as congregational singing is concerned, that was the mind of Pope Pius X. when he wrote of "active participation in the most holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church." Yet, while vocal participation in the liturgical offices of the Church is a powerful aid towards securing the desired intimate participation in them, it is not an essential means.

We are reminded of the theological principle on which is founded the Catholic doctrine of the veneration of the Saints: the life of blessedness promised to the just after the accomplishment of their earthly pilgrimage, and the unity of the Christian family in the mystical body of Christ, which unites all the sheep of the fold to the person of the one Shepherd. Devotion to the Saints, foreshadowed in the Synagogue, increased

equally with the development of theological doctrine and, because of its popular nature, was reflected throughout the ages in a thousand different forms of suggestive and artistic value according to the grades of culture shown by the Christian peoples. Contrary to the Protestant theory the veneration paid to the Saints is fully justified in Holy Scripture, in ecclesiastical tradition, and in the liturgical sources of the first centuries of the Church.

It was the liturgical piety of the early Christians that converted the ancient pagan world and it was liturgical life that made the Middle Ages great. There were, of course, evils also in the society of the Middle Ages. But the great troubles of the world came with the decay of liturgical life, and the introduction in its place, along with the abolition of public sacrifice, of individualism in religion by the Protestant reformers. What intimate participation in the Liturgy the life of the Church once accomplished, it can accomplish again. But we must pave the way for its full realization, so that the restorative powers inherent in it may act without hindrance.

Many long years have passed away since Newman quickened the hearts of English Catholics, saddened and discouraged by centuries of bitter desolation, with the glad hope of the Second Spring. That hope of a heritage regained, of a country once more brought back to Christ, has never altogether failed, but sometimes the fulfilment of the promise has seemed so slow in coming that hearts have sickened at a hope so long deferred.

Yet ought not Englishmen, above all others, to see in these vicissitudes and wearisome delays the very certain signs of spring? The spring comes softly and secretly in this land. Here and there a tender leaf-bud hiding in the hedges, a subtle fragrance sweetening the air, an inward intangible "something" in ourselves—these are the very heralds of the spring. Half of the year and more will pass before the harvest, and meanwhile biting winds and frosts will often seem to wither everything to winter once again. Men will grumble and predict calamity, but all the time they know that spring will surely blossom into summer, and that no plans or schemes, no unions or societies of men, can either hasten or retard it. They may neglect to co-operate or profit by it—that is all. So, although its progress is more largely in men's hands, the Church's springtime will ripen into summer after God's own way, if within their hearts its hidden "something" is a livelier love of God and devotion to His service.

The fruits of the liturgical revival are not the peculiar perquisite of the scholar or the student, but, as the supreme dignity and priceless worth of the Liturgy become more and

more evident to the mass of men, so will those who have the time and opportunity seek in increasing numbers to know more of its venerable origins and internal riches to which they are the heirs.

The liturgists have been fortunate enough to find a sphere of operations in which it has been possible for scholars differing in race and in religious views to work side by side, and in which learned conflicts of opinion have not as a rule been embittered by the *odium theologicum;* nor can any observer with at least some small degree of familiarity with the subject fail to see how greatly progress has been assisted by the willingness of one student to learn from another, and also how much there has been and may still be to learn.

Liturgical Movement means a movement towards the Liturgy, to bring it to bear upon the lives of the people. The purpose of the Liturgy is the sanctification of souls. The Liturgy is "the Church's official means of sanctifying souls and glorifying God." None other, then, can be the legitimate aim of the Liturgical Movement; any activity that does not ultimately tend to this is foreign to the Movement and detrimental to the attainment of this end. On the other hand, every action or practice that tends to attain this end is a worthy means of promoting the Liturgical Movement. And so it is also this truer purpose which gives its proper value to the vocal participation of the people in the sacred offices of the Church. The Church sanctions such participations, and the Liturgical Movement fosters it, just because, and just in so far as, it is the means of developing the liturgical idea of the active unity of the faithful in Christ, and of their consequent ever-increasing Christianization or sanctification in Christ.

In public prayer we recognize that all worship has two objects: one primary, the other secondary. The secondary object is to enable men to reach certain "emotions." The primary object is to enable man to worship God with collective worship. We might almost state the difference between the two by saying that in the first God is the object, in the second man is the object. It is the very genius of the Catholic Church to seek first the worship of God, assured that all else needed for the worshipper will follow from God's bounty. It is perhaps the particular half-truth of Protestantism to look upon the end of worship as some spiritual emotion, with which, in the dim alleyways of the human soul, can be confounded as mere æsthetic emotion. On the other hand, the Catholic Church is almost careless of the emotion but zealous for God.

To keep back the best from God is to steal from the necessary holocaust. Moreover, as the best must be given some-

where, if God does not receive it, some other creature like ourselves must receive what is fit only for the Most High. The Creator is robbed to pay the creature; and the work of God's hand is given the worship due to God alone.

Now, Art is man's highest expression of intelligence and emotion. Yet Art even at its highest is not wholly worthy of God. Deliberately to offer Him less than the highest Art, when we have the highest in our giving, would be to deny or slight His Godhead.

When, then, the solemn services of the altar are accompanied by the full worship of Art—when the rite takes place in a building planned and built on noble lines and lavish of noble spaces—when all around on the walls and distant roof and even on the feet-trodden floor beautiful shapes make appeal by their form and colour—when the eye is filled with the stately pageantry of serving men and boys and anointed priests who encircle the altar with a wreath of mystic movement—when the ear is appealed to by music not made after human harmonies heard on land and sea, but after some superhuman melody heard on the mount of vision—when the wafted incense summons us Godwards through our lowliest sense, no doubt every avenue of approach to God is thronged. Yet the whole ritual is not a supreme worship offered to our senses, but Art's supreme offering laid humbly upon the Altar of God.

A soul unaccustomed to these high ways of worship might say, "What sensuousness! What idolatry!" The exclamation would indeed be true, and the rite would be idolatry if offered to the senses or even to the intelligence of men. Yet is it no idolatry, but poor and halting worship of the Most High, since it is man's best offering to God alone.

The Liturgy aims at union with Christ through the Church. Christ is the spouse of the Church, united with her as with His mystical body. She lives by His Life. The expression of her life is the Liturgy. Therein she celebrates the mysteries of His life: therein she recalls His conception and nativity, His passion and death, His resurrection and His ascension, the glory of His blessed Mother and His saints, His teaching and His works, His whole life and its meaning; His sacraments and His other ministrations for men's salvation. With Him she praises and glorifies the heavenly Father; with Him she prays for all men and their needs; with Him she rejoices and is sad; she suffers and she triumphs; she hopes and cries out: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"; she loves and she gives everything for the sake of the beloved, until she can exclaim with Him: "It is consummated; into Thy hands I commend my spirit." This is her life, to be repeated year

after year until time is no more and united with Him in everlasting glory.

Thus the word "Liturgy" is that of a set form of public worship as distinct from private and interior worship of God. Those two elements are its body and soul, and these, like body and soul, may be over-emphasized one against the other into the sensualist or the manichee; there should be balanced encouragement and co-operation. Both are inspired by the Holy Spirit; the former possesses the central fact of the Mass, while the latter are an ecstasy of fervour inspired by the Mass.

FELIX HOPE.

THE HEALING OF THE GADARENE* DEMONIAC

NOTES OF AN 'ΙΔΙΩΤΗΣ ON THE GOSPEL STORIES†

A VISITOR'S first impressions of a new country have a certain value just because the visitor is struck by things too obvious and familiar to be noticed by people who know the country; so perhaps may there be some slight value in impressions made on the unlearned by the simple reading of Bible stories such as those of the Gadarene.

1. The first thing which strikes a simple reader is the apparent puzzledness of the accounts in the three Gospels.

Matthew, who had made it his business to gather and report the exact words of the Lord, is here so unsure of himself that he has got only one word: "go." And he understands that there were two demoniacs as well as some devils taking part in the talking and action. He does not attempt much detail.

Mark's account, as at first hand from one who was certainly better at deeds than at words, is naturally straightforward enough as regards the action; but, very naturally too, he finds it difficult to straighten out the dialogue. Still, it is more informative than Luke's.

Luke, as a physician, keenly interested in the case and, as a historian and artist, anxious to give a clear literary account of the "certainty of those things," is obviously at a loss. If clumsy is not too disrespectful a word, one might well say that this is the clumsiest bit in all his Gospel. He spoils the effect of the swift tense narrative by a long parenthesis (*v.* 29), going back to give further details of the desperateness of the case with which the Lord had to deal and interposing as an explanation the command which should have come at the

* Or Gerasene. † Matt. viii. 28-34; Mark v. 1-20; Luke viii. 26-39.

beginning of the story.* It is a halting, almost hesitating account, lacking in vividness and force, strange as coming from the pen of St. Luke. One cannot but ask why this is so; and the obvious and perhaps the true answer is that he did not quite know what to make of all he had heard. Lack of information, one may be sure, was not the fault; among the disciples in general few incidents in Christ's work would have been more often narrated or more keenly discussed. The truth surely is that the very eye-witnesses, alarmed and bewildered, could hardly take in what was happening; it was so stormy in passage, and in its implications so far beyond their reach.

2. The Great Physician, in His example and teaching, was in the main working as what we now call a doctor or a teacher of hygiene, prescribing for recovery and maintenance of health and showing how to practise healthy living. But His miracles, especially those of healing, were more like what we call surgical operations; specific acts setting right specific evils. And, like this work, they were, so far as we can judge, of many degrees of complexity and difficulty, from such (*e.g.*) as the healing of Simon's wife's mother upwards; difficulty not less or greater through any lack in the surgeon,† but depending on the kind and degree of the evil and on the general condition of the patients, especially in relation to the strength and the quality of their faith. Some miracles were performed in a moment and with no apparatus, some with preparation or by stages or with the use of outward visible signs.

This being so, the case of the Gadarene must surely have been of all difficult cases the worst. The evil had lasted a long time (Luke) and was of the worst kind. The man was possessed by many devils (Luke) unclean (Matthew, Mark), was exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way (Matthew), superhumanly powerful (Matthew, Mark, Luke), endowed with extraordinary "psychic dæmonic intelligence,"‡ a potentially fine man wrecked and gone to the bad.§

With keen wide-awake senses the man saw afar off the boat or little fleet of boats landing, and somehow he recognized the Prophet of Galilee, and somehow, with the præter-human knowledge common to demoniacs,‖ he knew Him to be "the Son of the Most High." He did not skulk or run away or hide in a tomb, but rushed on his fate. With wild cries taking the

* On the other hand, *v.* 36 is not a mere repetition, but a good touch. The terrified swineherds hastily delivered their news in the town and round about; and when their friends ran out with them to the scene of the wonders, they would tell the story again on the spot in full detail.

† Of the comparative personal cost to the Saviour of this or that miracle we had better not even try to guess (Matt. viii. 17).

‡ James iii. 15. § Corruptio optimi pessima. ‖ Luke iv. 41 and reff.

offensive, actively and violently antagonistic, he ran down and fell before Jesus, acknowledging His might but not any goodness in Him. "Hast thou found Me, O mine enemy?" "What have I to do with Thee, Thou Son of the Most High?" And he went on, "Is it to torment us that Thou art come hither?" (knowing perhaps more of the purpose of the journey than did the disciples). And again with crazy insult, was it fair play in the Son of the Highest to come before the due time? "I adjure Thee by God that Thou torment us not." All this and more was fiercely shouted at Jesus at close quarters. Never before in all His works of healing had Jesus met with anything like it. And it was after a disturbed night following a day's work so exhausting that His disciples had had to take Him in the boat "as He was" or "anyhow."* Surely Peter,† had he not been taught by the stilling of the tempest, would have wanted to fight or run away or both. It was more than flesh and blood could stand.

But to the Good Physician it was only an appeal for compassion. The devils, He had said, in answer to, what business had He there, must come out: but He did not hurry them. Nothing shocked Him. He listened quietly to what they might say and plead, without—as it would seem—trying to set them right in their estimation of Himself. And as He listened and spoke kindly as to a reasonable fellow-man, the demoniac's attitude gradually changed from defiant challenge to some partial gleam of trust and hope: it was clear that Christ's will must be accepted and obeyed, but it was no longer resented as cruel and unjust; rather, the man began to recognize some goodwill towards himself; it might be that the sentence would be carried out leniently, even with some mitigation. So he (or they) begged and implored not to be sent straightway to "the abyss" (Luke), and, gaining confidence, not even out of the country (Mark). Then, with amazing audacity, they preferred a positive and outrageous request "saying, send us to [or among] the herd of swine, that we may go into them."‡ And He said unto them, "Go" (Mark, Matthew).

Off they went, they and he, tearing along the hillside till, shrieking and yelling with mad antics, they came upon the swine, and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea and were choked. Partly it was a natural panic, partly

* ὡς ἦν, Mark iv. 36. Cp. John iv. 6, οὕτως.

† St. Peter must almost certainly have been there. "*The* boat," presumably the "small ship" which Jesus had asked for to "wait on Him" (Mark iii. 9), was more likely to have belonged to the householder Simon Peter than to have been that of the sons of Zebedee which they left with their father. And some of the outcries in the night are like him.

‡ Mark v. 12, *εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.*

they had caught the frenzy of the demoniac, as animals do catch the mood and obey the unexpressed will of human beings, and as not seldom with second sight they lie open to the influence of spirits bad or good where human beings discern nothing. And these creatures, half-wild, full of herd instinct, would be highly susceptible.

Swine and devils together they were gone, clean gone. The man actually saw them go. He was left standing alone, free, his own man. At that moment Jesus, watching, saw that His hour was come and spake the word, and the man in that very instant was made perfectly whole.

There the story leaves him for a while and turns to the swineherds and their friends in the town and the farms. By the time that they had heard the news and come to see what was done, they found the man out of whom the devils had departed sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind.

3. The sequel to the miracle gives hardly less cause for adoring wonder than the miracle itself:

"According to your faith be it unto you," in strength and quality: that is one unchanging truth wonderfully exemplified here.

To the people of Gadara the destruction of the many swine was more impressive than the healing of the one man, and accordingly they desired the wonder-worker to depart out of their coasts. He gave them the desire of their lean souls: it was of no use staying among people of so undiscerning and ungenerous a faith. They lost Jesus for the time.

The new disciple also preferred a request: a modest, natural, loving request; that he might be with him; and it was refused. Where the man had gone wrong he was to make good. He was to go first to his own home and family.* Strong personality as he was, and now filled with loving thankful faith, he could accept the refusal and the command, and threw himself whole-heartedly into the Master's work.

The same man earlier in the same day had made a request wholly unconscionable, extravagantly selfish with the unbalancing egotism of insanity, a request which no ordinary reasonable man would meet with anything but indignant refusal. Yet it was granted. For that was as far as the faith of the man had got. At his first contact with Jesus, the devils believed and trembled. They did well.† It was indeed a contact of flat opposition between Christ and Belial. But it gave an opportunity. (Even if it is the very devil in a man that drives him to Christ bitter and angry, there is a chance for good.) Then little by little, under the Saviour's influence, the quality of the

* εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σούς (Mark). † James ii. 19.

belief changed, becoming less demoniacal and more human, beginning to discern in Jesus something better than power; until at last He who did not shrink from touching a leper or being touched by a sinner could actually meet the man's faith by permitting the only means, however seemingly outrageous, whereby his faith could accept healing.

As for the swine and their owners, the difficulties sometimes made about them seem hardly worth considering. But the episode is full of illumination.

Christ had plainly taught, Ye are of more value than many sparrows. He continually kept emphasizing the immeasurable preciousness of one human soul in the sight of God. From one point of view that was in fact *The Gospel*.

As to the poor beasts themselves, they only existed for the slaughter. As to their money value, one main and constant strain in Christ's teaching was the worthlessness of earthly possessions. He was never tired of repeating this truth, reinforcing it in saying and parable. The destruction of property in the present instance was an object-lesson. It was what in an ordinary person we should call having the courage of his convictions. He made no explanation of it. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" that explains it. In the preceding night He had shown Himself Lord of the earth, disposing of it as through all history God disposes; not only for prosperity but also for calamity, wind and storm, fire and earthquake fulfilling His word. In all which troubles we believe without doubting that He takes into account as of the first importance the good of the soul of each human being concerned. And so with the owners of the swine. Concerning the individual sinner and Christ the whole story seems to be the Gospel writ small.

✠ Agnes Mason, C.H.F.

THE APOCALYPSE

In order to understand any literary work either ancient or modern we must have some knowledge of the class of writing to which it belongs, the customary conventions of such a class of literature, and the purpose which it has in view.

We must also know something of the external or historical conditions under which it came into being. We must also recognize the special characteristics of the writer, his type of mind, how he regards his material and how he makes use of it.

This would be the case, for instance, in our approach to the

Divine Comedy, or to the *Pilgrim's Progress*, or to the *Faerie Queene*. To understand the latter we ought to be aware how far apart its roots lie buried, partly in the fading memories of the Romance of Chivalry, partly in the poem of Ariosto, partly in the Platonic philosophy of love, distilled through Ficino; to understand Spenser we must have some acquaintance with the pageant of the Elizabethan Court, and realize that the poet's purpose was to instil a Christian morality into that sparkling world. This and much else would be the necessary introduction to the pages of the *Faerie Queene*.

No book needs such a studied approach more than the Apocalypse. On the one hand it distinctly ranks itself with a peculiar type of Jewish literature, remarkable for the strictness of its conventions, the similarity of its ruling ideas, purpose, and attitude to life; no literature is more recognizable as conforming to a well-marked and well-worked type than the apocalyptic. On the other hand, our Apocalypse largely explains itself as a violent reaction to historical conditions; in this it is in line with its many Jewish predecessors.

Without those actual conditions this book could not have been written. The young Empire of the first century, having for political reasons claimed Divinity for its rulers, bade men fall down and worship them at the very point of historical happenings, when a virile faith in a new monotheistic revelation had arisen, the hold of which on its enthusiastic disciples made such worship impossible. The writer of the Apocalypse was the spokesman of such believers; his passion, his incoherence, his bitterness are largely accounted for by the persistent pressure of Cæsar-worship.

Other historical conditions no doubt are mirrored in the book: the attitude of Jewish opponents in the Lycus valley to the growing religion that had sprung from their ancient Church, and the burgeoning of Gnostic heresy on its young branches; these and other actualities in the environment of the Asiatic Church on the stage of the life of the times had their influence on its tone and matter; but throughout the Apocalypse sounds the note of fear that the demands of the state will in the near future lead to a universal martyrdom, which will be the prelude to God's final judgment.

Then, as has been said, we must understand how the writer's mind works, and here we have a prophet. To understand a prophet some psychological knowledge is helpful. We shall not expect from him strict logical order, but a measure of intuition. We shall not be surprised if he vests his great ideas in varied and strange garments drawn from the caves and cabins of the subconscious; some will be rich and goodly,

some weird and bizarre, some shewing many signs of wear, so often have they been utilized by other minds. This applies in full to the Apocalypse; it requires earnest concentration and sympathy to discover and follow the threads that link together and develop its visions; more than once we suppose that we are about to reach the centre of the maze, but fail to attain it; the grand finale of its drama is postponed and postponed, and in the end is confused. The material, however, through which its thought is expressed is largely familiar; the ideas of Daniel, Ezekiel, Isaiah and Zechariah reappear in new forms; its pages can be annotated (and such annotations are often most illuminative) from such Jewish Apocalypses as 1 Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, and the contemporary works known as 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. Gunkel, again, has revealed ghostly remnants of primitive myth crouching behind the visions of the seer. We may or may not be able to trace a logical development in the book as a whole, but it is far more reasonable to be satisfied in such a work with an evolution akin to the looser associations of poetic writing; we shall then follow the constructive vision of a seer, journeying on a road interspersed with lyric songs unsurpassed in any literature, reaching at length the impression which he set out to convey, not by logical processes, but by sheer force of spiritual intuition.

It is an Apocalypse that the writer sets out to present. This form of writing had been in use among the Jews for some 300 years. He evidently intends to follow the conventions begun in the Book of Daniel, and continued in the various sections of Enoch. He can only be understood as standing in relation to a long line of predecessors; as a critic picturesquely says, "His Apocalypse in one aspect is the final and brilliant flash of the red light which had gleamed from Amos down to the Maccabees." That is to say, this apocalyptic writing was a specialized continuation of Jewish prophecy. How then would such a writer think about the nature of the work that he was undertaking? He would certainly regard it as a series of prophecies about the end of the existing order, an end understood to be near; he would look to include a description of certain stereotyped convulsions of nature, culminating in the coming of the Messiah, a final judgment, and the entry on a new and righteous era. Many such descriptions were already current in prophecy and the non-canonical writings, retailed probably in the circle of his early Jewish life. They would have the same character of inspired Scripture for him as the Book of Enoch had for the writer of the Epistle of Jude. The latter is very illuminative of the attitude of the early Christian Church to books not included in the Jewish

Canon. He would draw such material from the treasury of memory, adapted in its form to the new circumstances in which he found himself as a Christian prophet. His Apocalypse was thus differentiated from its predecessors or those of Jewish contemporaries by the deep consciousness of the new revelation of God in humiliation, by the Gospel of "the Lamb, who washed (or loosed) from sin in His own blood."

It would be inevitable that he would use the current symbolisms; the apocalyptic writer must express himself conventionally, with pictures of falling stars, darkened skies, the moon turned to blood, and earthquakes typifying the upheaval of society, and a catastrophic passing of the old order. He will run riot in the (to our minds) unnatural symbolism drawn from the animal world, lions and lambs, a very Whipsnade of wild beasts accompanied by queer multiform monsters; he will reproduce characteristic emblems like the sword proceeding from our Lord's mouth, not as a phenomenon actually seen, but imagined rather as the idea whose aspect it represents; such is the furniture of Apocalypse and the form in which it states its ideas; it alludes to a visual type, which is not meant to be regarded as concrete reality. The reason perhaps is that the language in which the apocalyptist wrote was devoid of abstract words.

Again, he will retain the determinism of his school. In apocalyptic every issue is decided beforehand, and every event must come in the place assigned to it. History is the mere unrolling of the divine intention; the future is a sealed roll, but it is already written in a roll, and its lines have been fixed from the foundation of the world; the revelation of this divine order of the succession of events is really an attempt to provide a philosophy of history.

Apocalyptic writers followed the lead of Daniel in adopting the convention of imagining themselves stationed at a point situated many stages before their own age, and describing what had happened in the intervening period in the terms of a prophecy by some ancient worthy; they then looked to the future and ventured to catalogue "the things which must shortly come to pass." So Macbeth sees kings "that twofold orbs, and treble sceptres carry" in his vision of the future.

In our Apocalypse the first four seals seem to represent past events, the last three what is still to come.

It is to be recognized that as time moved on and political forms changed, the apocalyptist was not deterred by reverence from revising and adopting for his own time old Apocalyptic messages; the oppressor that had once been the Greece of Antiochus Epiphanes becomes, in the eyes of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch,

and John the Seer, the Rome of their own day. It was even stated bluntly that Daniel's heavenly informant gave him incorrect information.

Jewish angelology was greatly extended in the apocalyptic period; in Daniel we have already travelled far from early Judaism, that knew only "the angel of the Lord," and Satan the accuser. A bewildering mass of Persian beliefs about good and bad angels and their specialized functions is present in Enoch and such writers; the direct action of God becomes rare, and He is thought of as working in nature and human affairs alike by means of intermediaries. But our Apocalypse, as Swete remarks, "is free from the wild speculations of Jewish angelology"; its angels represent the divine working, and support the divine glory; they do not move in an independent world; they either minister to God, or to man for God. We are in a different atmosphere from that of Enoch.

A mind fed on Apocalypse could hardly escape thinking of God's activity in terms of angelic activity; God must be to it the centre of a court of angelic assessors, with "living creatures" round Him summing up His creation in themselves, and singing His praise.

We find, too, that the primitive myths of the East are preserved, often obscurely and unconsciously, in apocalyptic. It is possible to be obsessed by this not unimportant factor, and to find Marduk, Ea and Tiamat the great serpent everywhere; but we should be grateful to Gunkel for pointing out how later writers felt their kinship with primitive ideas, and saw early prescience actualized in their own religion.

Combined with such legends there was astrology to draw upon. It is, after all, a form of angelology. It has left its impress in our Apocalypse in the Saga of the Woman and the Man-child, and on the gates of the New Jerusalem. The writer was perhaps unconscious of his astrological sources, but he certainly uses the conventions of astrology, and incorporates passages which seem akin to the purpose he has in hand. The symbolism of numbers, too, is everywhere; they still had mysterious and non-literal meanings, and suggested vague references to those who understood. Some such uses rest on astrology, notably the frequent 7, and next to it 12. The number 10 is common and its multiple 1,000 representing the indefinitely great; the $3\frac{1}{2}$ days of Daniel vii. 25 and xii. 7 signify the age of persecution, the broken 7, and is variously referred to as 42 months, 1,260 days, or "times, time, and half a time."

The Asiatic churches of our Apocalypse were in cities (and there were scores of such cities), which owed their security to the

strong arm of Rome. The "town-clerk" of Ephesus is an example of loyalty to the Imperial rule. One of the churches addressed, that of Pergamum, was in a state formally bequeathed to Rome in its last King's will. The Asiatics were loyal to Rome, in spite of the exactions of officials; we do not hear of revolutions in Asia Minor. And from the first Asia had welcomed the opportunity of worshipping, not only Diva Roma, but also Divus Cæsar. Rome had been worshipped before the Empire; there was a temple to Rome at Smyrna in B.C. 195. The inevitable connection of the cult with the reigning Cæsar was begun in the union of Dea Roma with Divus Julius in B.C. 29. Augustus had his temples, a precedent quoted by the men of Pergamum, when they wished to dedicate a temple to Tiberius (Tacitus, *Annals*, iv. 37). Caligula, madly egotistic, attempted to place his statue in the Jewish temple. Claudius was admitted to divinity by the Senate after his death, so Seneca tells us, and we know he had his temple at Colchester. It is curious, that, if the worship was taken seriously, St. Paul was so tolerant in his attitude to the Roman Government, but it seems there was no pressure on the small Christian churches to worship the Emperor till after St. Paul's death; neither Nero, Vespasian, nor Titus pressed it; the presumption is that until Domitian's reign the cult did not bulk very largely in the Lycus valley. But Domitian prefaced his official correspondence with *Dominus et Deus noster hoc fieri jubet*, and under him the religious recusant was suspected of high treason. It was in his reign that modern opinion places the writing of our Apocalypse, or, rather, its final editing. By that time an Augusteum was found in all great cities; towns vied with one another for the title of νεώκορος; worship was periodically organized and the Asiarchs presided at Quinquennial Games in honour of the Emperor, the civil and religious ceremonies coalescing.

Abstention from Cæsar-worship by a small community in the time of earlier Emperors was possibly not dangerous, but by the year 95 the Christian Church formed a substantial part of the population; it was, as 1 Peter shews, unpopular. The question of worshipping or abstaining from worship was a vital one both for the authorities and for the Christians; there was an inevitable clash of incompatible loyalties. To the Asiarch Christians were traitors to a paternal government, to the Christian the Emperor was no longer "the restraining power" recognized by St. Paul as an ally, but Anti-Christ a more loathsome foe than the Antiochus of Daniel.

With regard to actual persecution we know very little about its extent in Asia Minor during the first century; if it had been

systematic more than one martyr would have been named in the letters to the seven churches. It is really too much for Swete to affirm that "Nero initiated in 64 a policy of persecution which was not formally abandoned during the rest of the century." The outrage of the Vatican gardens must have struck horror through the Empire, but it was not the opening of a general persecution. It was *sævitia*, a bloody escapade that revealed Nero in his true sadistic character. The attribution of direct persecution to Domitian has to be supported by Swete by an allusion of Hilary of Poitiers written in the fifth century! Whether Merrill be a safe guide or not to the truth about the persecution under Domitian, at least he makes us inquire whether the burden of accusation can be fully supported by the evidence available.

Some acquaintance with the strange but widespread belief in the survival of Nero in its various forms helps us to understand the veiled allusions to him in the Apocalypse (xiii. 3, 12, 14 and xvii. 8). Nero was assassinated in 68; he was duly buried, and his tomb was strewn with flowers by his admirers. But such was the extraordinary vitality of this dæmonic man that people could not believe him to be really dead. A similar belief was current after the death of Alexander, and in our prosaic age strange tales were confidently told after the tragedy of Lord Kitchener's death. Nero could not be dead; he had escaped, such was the story, to the East, and would return with a Parthian army to make Rome his own once more (Suetonius, *Nero*, 57). There were several Perkin Warbecks of the East, who claimed to be Nero (Tacitus, *Hist.*, ii. 8); one of these, Terentius Maximus, was surrendered to Domitian in the year 88, and the belief survived till the time of Trojan (*Dio Chryst*, *Or*. xxi.). But besides this belief in an actual survival, there grew up the belief, presented in the Apocalypse, that it was a dæmonic Nero, identified with Belial, the fiend of the abyss, who would return at the head of evil spirits in the latter days.

It was with this picture in his mind that the seer perhaps worked in the slate-quarries of Patmos; it summed up his impression of the forces confronting the Church. Whether previous persecution had been sporadic or universal, slight or severe, he believed that the extermination of his religion would ere long be the aim of the all-powerful government. The actual situation fed his imagination, and impelled him to portray his conception of the coming struggle in a traditional form. It is the Imperial rule, centred in the Emperor, that is symbolized in the Beast rising from the sea; it is the popular state religion, with its Augustea, its Asiarchs, its crowded

temples and priesthood working feigned miracles, and its idols adorned with names of blasphemy, that is represented to his fevered mind by a second beast rising from the land itself. Both beasts have their origin in the source of all evil, the "dragon" of primitive myth, God's adversary, who is in later phrase "the devil and Satan." The mark of the beast may not have been a physical reality, but already throughout Asia Minor it was an actual reality, operating as a discriminating force in social life; abstention from the beast's worship cut off the Christian from trade and social advantages; the absence of the mark seemed likely before long to cut him off from existence altogether.

We should next consider what kind of person the writer of the Apocalypse reveals himself to be. He claims to be a prophet. Apostles and prophets are for him the chief forms of Christian ministry; he mentions no other, for we cannot regard the angels of the Churches as Bishops. He belongs, then, to the men of the Old Testament, who proclaimed, not their own message, but "the Word of the Lord." Originating in the circle of ecstatic dervishes, the prophets became in God's hands the highest of His means used to make Himself known to man. In them the divine and human were mingled; God did not use them as machines, but spoke through the channels of their human personality. Likewise in the restoration of prophecy in the Christian Church we find a mingling of human and divine. The part played by prophets in the Church during the first century is evident from the allusions to them in the Acts and in St. Paul's Epistles. From the latter it is evident that their speech was not regarded as infallible; it had to submit to apostolic restraint; its emotional energy was to be reined in by reason, "the spirit of the prophets was to be subject to the prophets"—*i.e.*, to the man as a whole; the prophetic output is even rationed by St. Paul in the Ecclesia of Corinth. Itinerant prophecy seems to be waning as a force in the *Didache*, which probably emanated from Syria in the age of the Apocalypse, and in the *Epistles of Ignatius* authority rests, not with the prophet, but with the local ministry of Bishops.

But it is as a member of the prophetic order that our Apocalyptist speaks with divine authority; it is his prophetic visions that he or a disciple puts together in a series probably at the end of a life of prophecy.

Now, prophecy and apocalyptic are the fruit of psychic experience and reflection. The rational faculty presents in a connected form for the enlightenment of other minds a kind of transcript of sub-conscious or semi-conscious emotional experience. We remember Wordsworth's definition of poetry:

"emotion recollected in tranquillity," and realize that poet and prophet are alike in being moved to garner the harvest of their emotional stresses. Charles divides such experience into dreams and visions, either in sleep or waking; such, with the exception of the sleeping vision, are exemplified in our Apocalypse. Such experiences are common to all religions, and, apart from influence on character, in themselves have little value; it is by their fruits that we know them to be influences of the Spirit of God.

The experience of the prophet and the seer can no doubt be distinguished; the one is a word, and the other something seen with the mind's eye. The seer's struggle to express himself for the benefit of others is the most severe, for he has not only to visualize a sphere foreign to his physical sight, but also to express as fully and truly as is possible the ineffable which lies behind physical experience. He is like a man with defect of speech describing what imperfect sight has enabled him to see imperfectly; and, worse, his audience is partly blind and deaf. This is why the seer's language must be symbolic. Symbols have either to be constructed on a scheme, as Blake built up his symbolic world, or use must be made of a traditional symbolism, such as the Jewish apocalyptists and Swedenborg employed. This use of traditional symbolism, like the use of well-worn similes in poetry, has always a danger of losing touch with reality and becoming conventional. In our Apocalypse there is evidence of a real fusion of psychic experience drawn from many sources; the work is not conventional mosaic, but an organic amalgamation; for instance, it draws greatly from the Old Testament, but never directly quotes; saying and incidents have been molten in the crucible and come out pure gold; thus the majestic figure of chap. ii. is an amalgamation of Ezekiel and David, and the Four Horsemen of chap. iv. are drawn from the pages of Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Zechariah.

Charles thought that reason is more active in the case of the seer than in that of the prophet in the arrangement of material; he comes nearer to the artist. He does not simply collect scattered items of experience; he deliberately sets out to weave his visions into a whole, a definite drama, a philosophic scheme of history; he constructs allegories founded on his experience, such as the seals, the bowls, and the trumpets of the Apocalypse; he is prepared to utilize the recorded experiences of others, if he finds in a document what is akin to the revelation that he is making, and finally he often sets a merely conventional value, in the manner of a poet, on the words "I saw"; the Visions of the Seven Churches are rather an intellectual construction than a transcript of crude experience, and the words

ascribed to our Lord are the message of the seer commissioned to speak in His name.

All this can be admitted without denying that there was real spiritual experience behind every apocalyptic vision; it came in a traditional form and it was delivered in a conventional manner, but it was authentic.

Many obscurities can be explained on these assumptions; but there are some that remain unilluminated. One is allowed to wonder whether the exercise of the reason in organizing the seer's recollections of his psychic experiences was as elaborate as Charles and other students suppose.

What is the value of the Apocalypse for the religious mind of to-day? Many, attracted by its more prophetic notes, turn away puzzled and disgusted by its queer symbolism and adaptations of mythical elements. It is difficult for a modern thinker to enter into sympathy with the mind of a Jew, converted to Christianity in the first century, and not clearly distinguishing between the Judaic and Christian factors in his faith; such was the seer of the Apocalypse, one who had great reverence for the symbols in which his ancestors in apocalyptic had cloaked their teaching; the modern mind is out of tune with such modes of expression, and there was perhaps some excuse for the nineteenth-century scientists' sneer at "the Paradise of the tabor."

But behind all that lies the value of the book. The value of the Apocalypse is that when the very existence of the infant Church was threatened, a prophet appeared to express the reaction of faith in tones that his own age could understand. Like Julian he proclaimed, "All will be well. All manner of thing will be well." It may be, he supposes, that the whole Church must prove its faith by martyrdom; but in the darkest hour Christ will return, destroy the agents of Satan, bind Satan, and reign with his rearisen martyrs for an indefinite period. That will be the Millennium of traditional outlook, the Jewish conception of the Messiah's earthly reign. But beyond that there must be a final conflict, a judgment, a passing away of heaven and earth, and the descent of a city, which will need no sun or moon, for God Himself and the Lamb will be for ever present in it. Such was the reaction of Christian faith to the terror of the time.

The permanent value of the inspired visions of the seer, however they be expressed, rests on the fact that the danger is not past. The Church and the world must ever be opposed to one another. The seer expresses the faith of the Church of all time called to stand up against all possible crises. In the bitterest hour her head is bloody but unbowed; the message

may come that the citadel of Odin is captured, but she answers, "Let us go and perish with Odin." Through history the Beast ranges, varying his methods of attack. Now he comes up from the sea as the tyrant of a faithless state; now he springs from the land as native superstition allied in its own interests with the state; his task is ever the same, to attack the Man-child and His Mother. The two witnesses bear their testimony in every age of crisis; they are cut down and their bodies lie in the street of the city, but faith holds that they are caught up to eternal life in heaven. It is the Beast that seems to triumph; it is the Beast that is marked for death.

Faith in the triumph of good, and in the redemptive work of One who sits with His Father on His throne, belief in the Kingdom of God upon earth, and the power of the martyrs' blood are expressed in the Apocalypse in words that do not fade.

It is the portrayal of a constant attitude of faith, not the anticipation of events in the future, that gives the book its value for every generation.

W. J. FERRAR.

MISCELLANEA

PARAPHRASING THE NEW TESTAMENT IN CHURCH

For homiletic purposes much might be done if certain phrases in the Epistles of the New Testament were vividly paraphrased. The attitude of most congregations when the Lessons are read has been aptly described as one of "devout inattention," and many sentences "pregnant with celestial fire" fall on leaking ears, conveying no meaning whatever.

For instance: *πλεονεξία ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία* (Col. iii. 5 and parallel Eph. v. 5), "covetousness, which is idolatry." Suppose those words were clearly and emphatically delivered as follows: "The desire to get more, which is the worship of a phantom," the most languid congregation would be brought a little nearer to the Apostle's point of view.

Now it so happens that it is really important to get at the meaning of *πλεονεξία*, for if our paraphrase is correct and expresses a truth the mass of the population of every Christian country are busied with the worship of a thing of nought. But our authorities differ. Moffatt renders the word by "lust," but not always. Lk. xii. 15 is decisively against it: so is 2 Cor. ix. 5. Eph. iv. 19: "lust" must mean "eagerness"; Eph. v. 3: the word here occurs in close association with *ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα*, but separated by *ἤ* it cannot mean the same thing; 1 Thess. ii. 5: "self-seeking" (M.); 2 Pet. ii. 3: neutral; 1 Cor. v. 10: *πλεονέκταις* separated from *πόρνοις* by *ἢ*, but coupled with *ἅρπαξιν*; vi. 10: *πλ.* in a catalogue divided from grievous sins of the flesh by *κλέπται*; 1 Thess. iv. 6: the verb plainly equals "overreach" (M.) as elsewhere, 2 Cor. ii. 11; vii. 2.

Now neither A.V. nor R.V. give any indication that the word has anything to do with the sins of the flesh. Nor is it easy to see how St. Paul could have spoken of such sins as *εἰδωλολατρεία*, whereas the eager pursuit of such sham goods as wealth or praise of man is quite correctly so described. (May not this be that the sensual man in the intervals between his indulgences generally hates the sin—but the victim of *φιλαργυρία* knows of no intermittence in his bondage, and even after he comes upon evidence that he is pursuing a mirage he cannot cease from craving?)

In short there seems no warrant whatever for attaching to *πλεονεξία* any meaning beyond that of an eager grasping at the good things of this world, except that we must add the unamiable feature of the quality—viz., that in his quest the *πλεονέκτης* takes no account of the claims of rivals, his only object being to overreach or take advantage of them.

It is, however, startling to find Moulton and Milligan in their great papyri dictionary supporting Moffatt's rendering "lust" and quoting Bunyan as coupling lust and greed of money. But the phrases quoted from papyri only show that in any enumeration of vices words denoting sensual passion are often found next to such a word as *πλεονεξία*, signifying a different but no less deadly perversion of desire. Juxtaposition is no indication of identity. It may be that a link between the two is suggested by the thought of idolatry in regard to *πλεονεξία*, the eager grasping at a shadow, and of the fact that gross vice had often and for many generations been associated with idol-worship and orgiastic rites. But can such a link be relied upon? At most it gives a reason for

an external association of two forms of depravity which does not imply essential similarity of character.

Lastly we must note that in practice there is not only no affinity between lust and "grasping ambition," but very often they conflict. Sensual self-indulgence often entails expense, and unless kept secret may shatter the hope of winning men's applause, this latter being a common object of ambitious desire.

I submit then that the evidence of the New Testament and of the papyri shows that we have no warrant for modifying the meaning of *πλεονεξία* as some of our modern authorities enjoin, against the traditional conception of grasping at material or temporary goods, especially wealth and the praise of men, even when it involves injury to others. But the inference to be drawn from this conclusion is formidable. It is that St. Paul reckoned *πλεονεξία*, covetousness, even when most fashionable and attractive, as a deadly abomination.

This at least is clearly implied in Eph. v. 3, where along with *πορνεία* and *ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα* it is mentioned as a sin which Christians ought not to speak of in ordinary conversation. It may have been due to this disquieting warning that such eminent authorities as we have quoted have been induced to interpret the word arbitrarily. For if the traditional meaning is retained some huge ethical problems start up before us. For instance: Some thirty years ago Scott Holland arranged a few talks with managers of big businesses. They were men of position in the City and for the most part high-minded Britons. But when confronted with the suggestion that a big firm should hesitate to invade a district and sell at a loss in order to crush out—not buy up—existing competitors, they repudiated it as a matter not fit for discussion. What St. Paul said was not fit for discussion or even mention was *πλεονεξία*. To-day the unmentionable subject is any checking of *πλεονεξία*. A further question into which we cannot go now is whether our Lord's teaching is as uncompromising as that of His great follower.

E. LYTTELTON.

REVIEWS

STUDIES IN EARLY ROMAN LITURGY, II. THE ROMAN GOSPEL-LECTIONARY. By W. H. Frere, C.R., Bishop of Truro. Oxford University Press. 25s.

With the modesty of a great man Dr. Frere calls his studies "amateurish." What then, we ask, gasping, would the real professional have achieved? The fact is, of course, that he has given all his leisure to the studies of his predilection, and in that sense can truly be called an amateur of liturgy. It is to be feared that the only word left for the rest of us (who rather like that sort of thing) is *dilettanti!*

The reviewer has reason to believe that this book was sent to him chiefly because he did not know too much about the subject, and therefore would be unlikely to mount, or even back, a hobby-horse. His task then is the straightforward one of saying what the book is about.

Dr. Frere's highly restricted objective is to elucidate the origins of the passages chosen for the liturgical Gospels between the years (approximately) 700 and 1100, and to group and classify the varying series until the date when the variations become so numerous as to defy such an operation.

He finds one key to the problem of chronological sequence in the fact that a Capitulary is commonly more conservative than a Comes or Gospel Series book. The former is what we should call a "Table of Lessons," the latter is a series of Epistles or Gospels written out at length. The latter was the book actually used in church and had to be up to date: the former often preserves a series which was at least obsolescent at the time when they were written out.

He takes as the "Standard Type" the models promulgated by Charlemagne at the end of the eighth century, and points out that they and the still "Earlier Series" exemplified by the famous Würzburg MS. have obviously some common original on which they are both based. The oddities, as they seem to us, of having always ten Gospels provided between Epiphany and Lent, when there cannot possibly be more than nine Sundays, and twenty after Pentecost, when there must be at least twenty-three (even counting five Sundays for Advent and none at all between Christmas and Epiphany), cannot have happened accidentally in two unconnected series. There is, moreover, a distinctive Old Roman arrangement of the Summer Sundays which is characteristic both of these and of later series, until it was ousted by the (perhaps Gallican) arrangement

which we now follow. According to all the purely Roman arrangements these Sundays never formed one continuous series from Pentecost to Advent: they fell into four groups, so that the disturbance caused by the variability of Easter was got over at the earliest possible moment by attaching all but the first to a fixed rather than a variable festival. There is then a common ancestor for the "Earlier" and the "Standard" types: but it is not to be thought of as the work of any individual compiler, but rather as the result of a somewhat careless and haphazard evolution. It is noticeable that the earlier part of the year is much more carefully planned than the later.

The ancient Roman arrangement at last lost its identity under various influences, perhaps to be described as "Gelasian," the most important of which was the segregation of the Sanctorale from the Temporale (with the one curious exception of the saints' days after Christmas). So, says the Bishop, "the inquiry is brought to an end in a multitude of variations of use."

For once the impeccable Clarendon Press seems to have committed a venial sin. The title on the cover does not correspond with that of the title-page. Not *The Roman Lectionary* but *The Roman Gospel-Lectionary* is the true title.

KENNETH BRECHIN.

HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION IN THE GOSPELS. (Bampton Lectures for 1934.) By Professor R. H. Lightfoot. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

We cannot help feeling that Professor Lightfoot has missed a great opportunity. There is a very real need of an authoritative attempt to estimate the historical evidence for the life of Our Lord in the light of the modern recognition of the fact that in the Gospels we are faced, not with historical biographies, but with collections of anecdotes as to the sayings and doings of Jesus, arranged partly to meet the needs of catechetical instruction in the early Church and partly to illustrate a doctrinal thesis, the Messiahship of Jesus. The critical point of view, generally known by its hideous German title of *Formgeschichte*, can be used, as it has largely been used in Germany, as a method of arriving at a complete state of scepticism as to the possibility of knowing anything as to the historical Jesus. It is supposed that when we discount considerations of doctrinal interpretation and the edification of the community, we have nothing left which we can regard as authentic history.

Now it may be admitted at once that we cannot regard the

Gospels as strictly scientific history in the modern sense of the word; they do not profess to give a scientific and impartial interpretation of the facts. And we can trace in them a growing tendency to enhance the person of Jesus; the human teacher is being replaced by the glorified Lord, who again is replaced in the Fourth Gospel by the Incarnate Logos. All this is true, and it means that in any particular detail it is often impossible to be certain whether we are dealing with pure record of fact or with the interpretation of fact in the light of faith. Here Professor Lightfoot is perfectly right, though it may be doubted whether it was necessary to labour the point at such length; we should have supposed that it was generally recognized that the process of interpretation is already at work in St. Mark; *The Riddle of the New Testament* made the point abundantly clear.

But there is another side to the matter. The figure of Jesus in the Gospels cannot be fitted into any categories of thought whether ancient or modern. He is not the conventional figure of the Jewish Messiah. He is certainly not a Jewish Rabbi; still less is He a prophet, for He speaks in His own name, not merely as a messenger of God. Nor is He the exponent of a simple ethical message of the brotherhood of man. Readers of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* will remember the pathetic attempts which have been made to fit Him into such categories as these. Yet Professor Lightfoot's almost complete scepticism is almost as pathetic a failure. For when all has been said and done the synoptic Gospels do present us with the picture of a vivid and concrete personality, a figure which we cannot profess to understand, but to which we can certainly render our allegiance, and, further, a figure which we cannot suppose to have been constructed by the imagination of the first disciples.

The real question is whether the primitive collection of stories does go back to authentic reminiscences, and whether those reminiscences were well chosen to bring out the personality and teaching of the historical Jesus. It must always be remembered that there is a grave difficulty in supposing that one who could impress His disciples as Jesus did should none the less leave behind Him no authentic memories. On the other hand, it is well to remember that the narrative of any events, as told by the ordinary man, will always be found to contain discrepancies and inconsistencies if it is subjected to detailed examination by a hostile counsel; and Professor Lightfoot's treatment of the Marcan narrative amounts to such an examination, for he seems determined to find difficulties at every point.

The main problem of Mark is of course the so-called Messianic secret. Why does Jesus at times order those who recognize

Him as the Messiah, whether evil spirits or disciples, to tell no man? One explanation is of course that the historical Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah or regarded Himself in that light, and that the belief that Jesus was the Messiah only arose after His death. On the other hand, it is more probable that He, like all other Messianic figures of the century, came forward as a leader of the nation with an enigmatic title, which challenged His hearers to ask themselves whether this was the Christ or not. The title "Son of Man" is just as enigmatic as the title "son of the star" or "a voice crying in the wilderness" or "the great power of God." If Jesus wished to force His hearers to put the question to themselves, it is natural that He should refuse recognition from unclean spirits, and desire to avoid undue publicity. But it is essential to begin by recognizing this peculiar feature of Jewish Messianic movements, that the Messiah never proclaims Himself, but challenges recognition. Such a "secrecy" is quite compatible with public proclamation of the Kingdom of God and the need for repentance.

Again, it is essential to recognize how vague the Messianic figure was. Professor Lightfoot says that the Messiah was not expected to work miracles of healing, but it would be truer to say that anyone who worked wonders was certain to be regarded by his followers as a potential Messiah and by his enemies as a magician. Here Professor Lightfoot has fallen into the error of supposing that the Messiah must conform to any particular type; at one point he recognizes the vagueness of the idea, but immediately falls into the error of treating it as a fixed concept. Here his appreciation of the atmosphere of Palestine in the first century is gravely at fault; it is equally so in his account of the trial of Jesus. If we suppose that the Sanhedrin ever allowed itself to be governed by the procedure of the Tractate Sanhedrin, the whole affair is impossible; but no state could conceivably have existed which really followed such methods in its criminal procedure. Moreover he has fallen into a grave error in regard to the competence of the Sanhedrin to put Jesus to death; he quotes M. Juster as evidence for the possession of such a power: "In addition to the account in Acts of the execution of St. Stephen . . . is the putting to death, by stoning, of James the brother of the Lord, and certain others . . . as narrated by Josephus (*Antt. XX, ix.* 1)." So Professor Lightfoot, falling into the deadly trap of quoting at second hand; for what Josephus says is that Ananus seized the opportunity of a gap between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus to put these persons to death, and that on the arrival of Albinus the Pharisees complained of his action, with the result that Albinus wrote a letter threatening to

punish Ananus, who was thereupon deposed by Herod Agrippa. M. Juster may have an explanation of the passage; but on the face of it, Josephus supports the Gospel account, and one can only wonder whether Professor Lightfoot verified his reference.

Or, again, when Professor Lightfoot discusses the doctrinal interpretation of the person of Jesus in the early Church he writes as though there were a real development in St. Paul's views between the pre-existing Christ, who had to suffer before He could be glorified, as described in Phil. ii. 7, and the Logos-Wisdom of Colossians, and again as though these two conceptions involved a development of the Messianic belief of the primitive Church. (Why Colossians should be regarded as later than Philippians I cannot understand.) But, as the late Professor Burkitt once pointed out in my hearing, if you seriously believe in a Messiah who has risen from the dead, you have to fit Him into your cosmogony; Colossians and the Fourth Gospel simply describe the position of the Lord in the scheme of things from the point of view of those who are interested in cosmogony rather than in Messianic hopes—in fact, Hellenized the Jews. Nor is there any reason for supposing that St. Paul was ignorant of or indifferent to the historical facts of the life of Jesus; his reference to knowing Christ after the flesh in 2 Cor. v. 16 only proves that for him the mystical union with Christ of the conversion experience is more important than that careful and sometimes scrupulous obedience to the teaching of the Lord as handed down by the leaders of the community at Jerusalem to which he refers in i. 16 *seqq*. No doubt St. Paul sometimes found their pedantry tiresome; but it is to their pedantry that we owe the preservation of the teaching of Jesus, and there is no reason to suppose that they have seriously distorted it, though their selection may have been influenced by motives of piety or controversial expediency.

Altogether the book is a disappointment. Professor Lightfoot writes with a genuine love of the Jesus of the Gospels. But we cannot feel that he has contributed in any way to the solution of the difficulty of the relation of "the Jesus of history" to "the Christ of experience."

WILFRED L. KNOX.

ON THE EPICLESIS OF THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY AND IN THE CONSECRATION OF THE FONT. By E. G. Cuthbert F. Atchley, L.R.C.P. Lond., M.R.C.S. Eng. Pp. 210. Alcuin Club Collections, No. XXXI. Oxford University Press. 21s.

There has for some time been need of a comprehensive work on the Epiclesis. Much has been written since L. A. Hoppe

published his study in 1864; but the greater part of the material is scattered about in the form of articles in journals, and of appendices and notes to works not immediately treating of the subject. The late Mr. J. W. Tyrer's *Eucharistic Epiclesis*, published in 1917, in not pretending to be more than a brief and one-sided résumé of a considerable subject, served but to emphasize the want of a full and impartial examination. The article "Epiclèse," published in 1922 by Dom F. Cabrol in the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* (t. v., cols. 142-184), while it covers the ground up to date, is necessarily summary and is also perhaps not widely available.

Mr. Atchley's volume would appear to be an essay at supplying the want. It deals with the Baptismal as well as with the Eucharistic Epiclesis; but the latter, on account of its greater intrinsic interest and importance, not unnaturally receives more attention. Beginning with a chapter on the meanings of ἐπίκλησις, ἐπικαλεῖν, *invocatio* and *invocare*, Mr. Atchley proceeds to survey the evidence afforded by liturgies and ecclesiastical writers, both Eastern and Western, from the New Testament and Ignatius to the English divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In a final chapter and note, covering rather more than two pages, hé lays his conclusions before us. The reader, however, will be in no doubt as to the conclusions long before he reaches the final chapter. From the beginning of his book Mr. Atchley's purpose is clear. He is at pains to shew that as a consecratory petition the Epiclesis appears in the Eucharistic Prayer at the beginning of the third century, and that it probably existed in the second, if not the first, century. The original form of the Epiclesis, he maintains, is a petition for the illapse of the Spirit upon the elements, not upon the congregation. The latter type of petition he ascribes to the fifth century. Mr. Atchley's book is therefore definitely a *tendenzschrift*, the motive of which is revealed in the final note, wherein the author complains that "the last revision" of the Prayer Book, with a form of Epiclesis in its Communion Service, "was rejected, in complete ignorance of the facts and the doctrine involved."

That a prayer for the consecration of the eucharistic bread and wine by the illapse upon them of the Holy Spirit was already in use by the middle of the fourth century is indisputable. The 23rd Catechetical Lecture of Cyril of Jerusalem, delivered probably in A.D. 347 or 348, is explicit on the point. The question, however, is: Does the evidence indicate the existence of such a prayer at an earlier date? Mr. Atchley is reluctantly compelled to admit that before the third century there is no clear witness. Irenæus, he thinks, may have been familiar with a "consecration prayer" containing, "besides a thanksgiving,

some sort of petition for the Holy Spirit to hallow the oblations," and he cautiously, and rightly, decides that "there is no direct evidence thereof."

The oldest known Epiclesis formula, and probably also the earliest evidence for this class of petition, is that preserved in the Verona Latin Fragments published by E. Hauler in 1900. The Epiclesis, and the Eucharistic Prayer in which it occurs, are a Latin translation of a Greek original, which was to be found in a lost document, now generally recognized to be the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. The Latin version of the petition runs: *et petimus, ut mittas spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctæ ecclesiæ; in unum congregans des omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in repletionem spiritus sancti ad confirmationem fidei in veritate.* There is, as Mr. Atchley affirms, no question as to the nature of the *oblatio* here mentioned; it is the eucharistic bread and wine. There can be no doubt that this is a petition for the illapse of the Spirit upon the elements. Is it, nevertheless, an Epiclesis, in the sense in which that term is now used by Greek theologians? Mr. Atchley is certain that it is, and goes so far as to say that to consider it otherwise is "mistaken and untheological," on the ground that both East and West believe eucharistic consecration to be effected by the operation of the Spirit. The question to be considered, however, is one not so much of modern or mediæval, but of ancient belief. From the fourth century onwards the purpose of the illapse of the Spirit is said to be that the elements may be "made" or "changed into" the Body and Blood of Christ. The intention of the petition before us, on the other hand, is that those who partake of the oblation into which the Spirit has been sent may be filled with the Spirit. In other words, whereas the content of the Eucharist over which the normal type of Epiclesis (as suggested by Cyril of Jerusalem, and as found in, *e.g.*, the Liturgy of St. James) is recited is believed to be the Body and Blood of Christ, here it is understood to be Holy Spirit. To maintain otherwise is to incur the charge of being "mistaken and untheological."

When the fourth-century compiler of *Apostolic Constitutions* recast and expanded the Hippolytan Eucharistic Prayer for the Liturgy in his Eighth Book, in order to bring the Epiclesis into conformity with the standard of his day, he added a clause to the effect that τό ἅγιον πνεῦμα, having been sent down upon the oblation, might "shew" it to be the Body and Blood of Christ. At the same time words expressive of the earlier intention were allowed to remain; ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες . . . πνεύματος ἁγίου πληρωθῶσιν represents *in repletionem spiritus sancti* of the Verona Latin. Although the compiler has not here inserted the definite article before πνεύματος ἁγίου,

Mr. Atchley, in his reconstruction of the Greek, has nevertheless supplied it. It may be that here we have the clue to his misunderstanding of the Hippolytan Epiclesis. He seems to interpret all references to the Holy Spirit, early as well as late, in terms of a fully-developed Pneumatology. It would have been well if, following upon his discussion of the meanings of ἐπίκλησις, he had embarked upon a similar examination of the terms "Spirit," "Spirit of God," "Holy Spirit," "the Holy Spirit," etc., both in Latin and Greek. In brief, the Epiclesis of Hippolytus, so far from being indistinguishable from that of, *e.g.*, the Jerusalem Liturgy, as Mr. Atchley would have us think, is, on the contrary, not fundamentally different from that of the Valentinian Marcus (to whom Mr. Atchley refers in his chapter on Irenæus), who invoked Charis instead of Holy Spirit, and whose communicants expected to be filled with Charis. That Mr. Atchley should have ignored this interpretation is astonishing, both because he is aware that certain writers are to be understood as regarding the Spirit as the content of the Eucharist, and also because the idea underlying the Hippolytan type of Epiclesis is clearly expressed in a passage occurring in a treatise which Mr. Atchley cites—viz., Tertullian's *De Baptismo*: "Every underlying substance must catch the quality of that which is suspended over it, particularly when the former is corporeal and the latter is spiritual, as the spiritual by the fineness of its substance can easily penetrate the corporeal, and also settle [*insidere*] in it" (§ 4, A. Souter's translation, S.P.C.K., 1919).

Can we endorse Mr. Atchley's contention that an invocation of the Spirit upon the communicants is an innovation of the fifth century? The question cannot be answered easily or briefly. Mr. Atchley states that the earliest witness is Narsai of Edessa, whose literary activity stretches from *circa* 437 to 502. It has, however, escaped Mr. Atchley's notice that an invocation of this kind was also known to Theodore of Mopsuestia a generation earlier. In his Discourse on Eucharist and Liturgy (preserved only in a Syriac translation, edited by Dr. A. Mingana in *Woodbrooke Studies*, vol. vi., 1933), Theodore says that the priest prays "that the Holy Spirit may descend and that grace may come therefrom upon the bread and the wine," and further "that the grace of the Holy Spirit may come also on all those present, in order that . . . they may be knit here as if into one body by the communion of the flesh of our Lord" (*op. cit.*, p. 104). Theodore's language recalls the Epiclesis in the Liturgy of St. Basil, in which the petition for the illapse upon the oblation is an interpolation into an older prayer for an illapse upon the communicants, to the intent that the latter, partaking of one bread and cup, may be "united with each other into a fellow-

ship of one Holy Spirit." This again recalls the prayer for unity in the *Didache*; and the difficult Latin, together with the words *in unum congregans* in the Verona Epiclesis, suggest that the original Greek of that invocation may itself have been in its first state a prayer for unity. The subject can only be mentioned in the course of a review; it deserves, and should have had, a full discussion in Mr. Atchley's book.

Want of discussion is, indeed, the principal weakness of this study. In spite of its admitted importance, the Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* receives rather less than six pages, in which there is no detailed examination of problems of textual unity, provenance, and diffusion of use among Christians in Rome. It is assumed that third-century Roman usage was necessarily uniform, and that therefore an Epiclesis has dropped out of the Latin Canon of the Mass. It is taken for granted that the reference of Pope Gelasius I. to an invocation of *cœlestis spiritus* at "the consecration of the divine mystery" is sufficient evidence for the continuance of an Epiclesis in the Roman Canon up to the end of the fifth century, the liturgical matter in *De Sacramentis* and the problems connected with it having been discussed without adequate comment. The worst examples of Mr. Atchley's method, however, occur in his chapters on Cyprian and Sarapion respectively. Cyprian's statement in his letter about the lapsed bishop Fortunatianus, that "neither can the oblation be hallowed where the Holy Ghost is not," leads Mr. Atchley to think it "probable that there was some petition therein [*i.e.*, in the Eucharistic Prayer] for the Holy Ghost to hallow the oblations." When taken in its context, Cyprian's statement suggests no such probability. Cyprian's purpose is to warn his correspondents that ecclesiastics who, by lapse from the one only Church, have been deprived of the Holy Spirit have thereby also lost the power to act in the character of priests. In the case of Sarapion, Mr. Atchley suggests that the invocation of the Word has replaced an original invocation of the Spirit, both in the Eucharist and Baptism. There is nothing in any of Sarapion's prayers to warrant Mr. Atchley's suggestion. On the contrary, the form of the reference to the Spirit in Sarapion's doxologies renders it highly unlikely. The reader will note with some surprise that both here and elsewhere Mr. Atchley fails adequately to discuss the question of an Epiclesis of the Word. Equally surprising is his omission, when dealing not only with Sarapion's, but also with other liturgical material, to take account of Dr. H. Lietzmann's work in his *Messe und Herrenmahl*.

It is clearly Mr. Atchley's concern throughout this book to controvert the views advanced by the late Mr. Edmund Bishop,

the late Mgr. P. Batiffol, the late Dr. Armitage Robinson, and Dr. J. H. Srawley. It is the more disappointing, therefore, that the arguments of these writers are met less often by argument than by assertion. Mr. Atchley may be right in pointing out that the first appearance of the Epiclesis cannot be made to coincide with the Pneumatological disputes of the latter half of the fourth century. That, however, is not the point at issue. The question remains precisely where it was left by Mr. Edmund Bishop and those in agreement with him. For the Epiclesis as a prayer for the change of the eucharistic elements into Christ's Body and Blood by the operation of the Holy Spirit there is no evidence earlier than the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem. For all his labour (which, as the notes alone demonstrate, has been considerable), and in spite of his learning (which is undeniable), Mr. Atchley cannot revive the tradition of those erudite Lutherans, Grabe and Pfaff. In attempting to do so, he has given us a misleading and inadequate book.

EDWARD C. RATCLIFF.

NOTICES

SONS OF GOD. A Devotional Commentary on the Fourth Gospel. By W. E. Lutyens. S.P.C.K. 5s.

There was once a man who loved the Gospel according to St. John very much indeed. Every day he read portions of it, and every day it became more and more precious to him. Thoughts of adoration rose up in his mind as he turned its pages, and fresh knowledge of sacred mysteries came to him spontaneously. Then, as he read, he got into the way of setting his ideas down on paper, until presently he found that he had written a book.

The book was duly published, and came back into his hands with just that touch of strangeness that our thoughts have when they stand before us in the objectivity of print. The author looked it through—these things were well said, this incident had been correctly understood, the meaning of our Lord's words had been penetrated. Nevertheless, as he read, the sense of the inadequacy of his finest phrases, his subtlest interpretations, came over him. Icarus-like, his wings failed him as he approached the blaze of uncreated Light. He closed the book and turned away, bending before God in wordless prayer.

Forgive me. I do not know Father Lutyens of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, Cambridge, the author of this very beautiful and moving commentary, and I have no idea how the volume came to be written. It is, however, a work which one can hardly praise too highly. We find in it nothing trivial, nothing grandiloquent, nothing sentimental. Critical ability and good scholarship, the spirit of true charity towards every branch of the Christian Church, the gift of imaginative insight, real spirituality, all are present.

And yet my most vivid impression is of the contrast between the commentary and the sacred tact. Here are human words, thoughtful, reverent, seemly. And here are words which we recognize as divine.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

SOME STUDIES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By H. F. B. Mackay. Centenary Press. 6s.

Here we have twenty-four Sermons, most of them preached in All Saints', Margaret Street, by Prebendary Mackay, and ranging over a considerable part of the Old Testament. The standpoint is conservative. The preacher assumes, *e.g.*, that the eight persons in Noah's Ark were the sole representatives of the human race after the Flood (p. 16), and takes literally the story of Jacob's wrestling with God (p. 44), though he hesitates about Balaam's ass (p. 62), and offers an explanation of "Sun, stand thou still" (pp. 78-79). Some of his statements are surprising—*e.g.*, that the story of Jacob and Rachel is "the most beautiful love-story in the world" (p. 40), and that "the Battle of Reth-horon was the most important and critical battle in the history of the world" (p. 75). We should question, too, some of his theological statements—*e.g.*, that "whenever we suffer we do feel that it is no more than we deserve" (p. 14), which seems to be contradicted by the story of Bishop Collins on the next page; that "plague, pestilence, and sudden death are God's judgments" (pp. 56-57), or, still more surprisingly, that "the hospital, the prison, and the roadhouse all register His decrees" (p. 98). If this means that all illness and all lunacy are sent by God we dissent most strongly. Again, have raisings from the dead really been conspicuous features of the Church's life down the centuries? (p. 110). Occasionally we get an arresting sentence. Thus: "Three-quarters of the attacks on the subject-matter of the Catholic religion have been made in the name of Christ. Gnosticism said it was intellectual Christianity; Montanism said it was spiritual Christianity; Arianism said it was primitive Christianity; Donatism said it was pure Christianity" (p. 144). Or this: "The greatest glory of the Christian Church is the example of the martyrs; but now that we are living under the conditions which produced martyrs, some faithless souls are doubting the goodness of God" (p. 198). Or with a smile: "I wonder how many times in history strict logic has demanded the condemnation of archbishops and bishops" (p. 168).

The most effective sermons are "The Nine-and-Twenty Knives"—though why was the *Roman* canon quoted?—and those on the Visions of Zechariah.

A. E. MORRIS.

THE RAS SHAMRA TABLETS, THEIR BEARING ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By J. W. Jack, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 3s.

The Ras Shamra Tablets have enjoyed such publicity through the popular writings of Sir Charles Marston, that this authoritative description of them by a scholar of Dr. Jack's independence will be hailed with eager curiosity by every Bible student. It is obvious at once that their value has not been exaggerated. From the point of view of Biblical archæology, there has been nothing perhaps of equal importance since the discovery of the Hammurabi Code over thirty years ago—unless, indeed, it be the Lachish Letters, even now "going to press."

The Tablets, contemporary with the famous Tell el Amarna Tablets of 1400 B.C., emanate from a Phœnician settlement which had close affinities with primitive Canaanite culture, especially with the North Arabian Land of Midian, whence Moses drew much of his inspiration. They take us back, therefore, to the pre-Mosaic stratum of Hebrew origins, and cast an unexpected blaze of light upon some of the darkest corners of the Old Testament.

Thus, they provide us with the "missing link" in the evolution of the Hebrew alphabet, several of the tablets exhibiting a cuneiform script no longer syllabic but simplified into thirty letters. The language in this case is an archaic form of Hebrew, and it is said that the linguistic discoveries will "revolutionize Semitic lexicography." The mythology of the Tablets throws an interesting light on pre-Hebrew Canaanite religion. The father of the gods is El, his chief opponent Baal. Baal's son, the god of the underworld, is called Baal-Zebul. Frequent allusion is made to the god Salem (Saviour), after whom Jerusalem is thought to have been named. Ashtaroth and Ashera, it seems, were two distinct goddesses. Incidentally the Tablets shew that mythologically the Phœnicians and the Hyksos were closely related.

Several familiar Biblical names appear also on the Tablets. Especially interesting is that of Daniel, the "representative of justice, who defended the oppressed," perhaps the legendary hero mentioned three times by Ezekiel. Adam, the "Man from the East," appears in conflict with the gods. Leviathan is described in almost Biblical terms: "*When thou smitest Leviathan, the swift serpent, . . . the powerful one with seven heads.*" Most striking of all is the Legend of Kereth, King of Sidon (ancestor of the Cherethites ?), who in alliance with the tribe of Asher did battle with the forces of Terah and of Zebulon, a story which sounds like an echo of Abram's invasion. In one place these invaders are even designated under their well-known name, *Ibrim* (Hebrews), as in the Old Testament (compare the *Habiru* of Tell el Amarna). The Horites, hitherto believed (like the Hittites, at one time) to be legendary, now leap into significance as the *Hurrians*, with a language and importance of their own. And there are a hundred further points of contact (many of them conjectural, it is true) which make the Ras Shamra Tablets, and this little book about them, a most fascinating study.

S. L. CAIGER.

THE LABYRINTH: FURTHER STUDIES IN THE RELATION BETWEEN MYTH AND RITUAL IN THE ANCIENT WORLD. Edited by S. H. Hooke, M.A., B.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The indispensable clue to this somewhat recondite symposium is to be sought in an earlier volume to which it is a sequel—namely, *Myth and Ritual*, by the same editor. In that volume an attempt was made to find a lowest denominator common to the principal religions of the ancient East, and it appeared in an archetypal dramatic ritual representing the death and resurrection of the king-god, together with its appropriate myth. The object of the present volume is to pursue the history of this ritual-myth in its later and often scarcely recognizable developments.

Thus the title-essay (C. N. Deedes) traces the evolution of the maze back through its various transformations to the Cretan Labyrinth of the Bull, and its penultimate origin in the encircling dance around the death

and resurrection of the Osiris Bull in Egypt. In this and in other essays there are good and novel illustrations to explain the points raised. Particularly ingenious is an essay on *The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus* (A. R. Johnson), where it is shewn how in Biblical times the king summed up in himself both the corporate personality of the nation and the Divine immanence of its God, being thus in a sense both God and Man. Phrases of the liturgy of the New Year Festival are then adduced to expose an original derivation of the king's part therein from the primitive king-god myth. Stimulating, if not convincing.

Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has a fascinating study of a little-known by-path of mythology—the Mystery Cult of the Phrygian beer-god, Sabazius. Apart from its point, which is to prove how pointless the later hybrid evolution of ritual could become, the article is a perfect mine of quaint and curious information. What reader will ever forget his description of that uncanny Clutching Hand of Sabazius? Students of later Judaism will be grateful for Dr. O. S. Rankin's massive and learned article on the late Jewish Feast of Dedication (Hannukkah), in which he detects surprisingly, but with apparent reason, elements derived from the Hellenistic festivals of Dionysus (Sabazius again) and Apollo.

We return to the main theme in the editor's exceedingly suggestive article on the recrudescence of the ancient king-god myth (now divorced, of course, from ritual) in later Judæo-Christian apocalyptic. The Messiah conquers death in various mythological forms, and rises to triumphant life. After this, Dr. E. O. James has no difficulty in shewing the connection between the Christian ritual of the Mass and that of the primæval king-god ceremonies. Altogether an interesting, close-knit, and obviously authoritative footnote to the study of several little-known by-paths of comparative Theology.

S. L. Caiger.

Der junge Luther und Augustin. By A. Hamel. Part II. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann. M. 7.

Lately we have been reading many German books on Luther, and at first we felt distinctly puzzled by their multitude, for, after all, did not the German Reformation effect a fairly complete break with the past? Why, then, trouble with a reformer who belonged to the past so much as Luther? A perusal of these books, as well as the two parts of Herr Hamel's able study of the young Luther and St. Augustine, has enabled us to grasp the German attitude to the reformer. For many of them, though not for all of them—and here our author is an exception—the reformer is a politician who heralds the new conception of State and Nation. The irony of history is certainly strange. John Calvin founded States through his principles because he believed in the priesthood of the laity. Martin Luther did nothing of the sort partly because he never recovered from the shock of the Peasants' Revolt, and partly because he was obliged to put himself into the power of the princes, and that power he was never wholly able to shake off. He, the least systematic of thinkers, is now displayed to our notice as a statesman of the calibre of Calvin. It is an amazing conception, yet it is a conception full of meaning at this moment in Germany. Herr Hamel is more properly occupied with the years from 1515 to 1518, when there appeared Luther's commentaries on the epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Hebrews. Underlying the thought of these three commentaries Herr Hamel finds everywhere

the influence of the African Father, and we do not feel disposed to quarrel with this ubiquitous influence. St. Augustine, his mark, is written all over the three of them. Perhaps here and there the author is needlessly ingenious in his discernment of one thought of one of the men who has done most to shape the thought of mankind. On the whole, his book is a solid contribution to the important subject with which it deals, and for it we entertain that wholesome admiration it deserves.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

STUDIES AND DOCUMENTS. III. A GREEK FRAGMENT OF TATIAN'S DIATESSARON FROM DURA. Edited with facsimile, transcript, and introduction, by C. H. Kraeling, Ph.D. London: Christophers. 7s. 6d. (Or by annual subscription for the series, £2 10s.)

For more than fifty years the sands of Egypt have yielded important materials for the Christian archæologist; it is less widely known that those of Mesopotamia have begun to do the same. The excavations at the Romano-Parthian fortress of Dura-Europos revealed in 1931 traces of an early third-century Christian chapel; further work in 1933 brought to light this fragment of what may be considered one of its liturgical "books"—fourteen lines of a parchment roll in a script of *c.* A.D. 225, containing a Gospel harmony more or less certainly identified as Tatian's famous *Diatessaron*.

This work, which for centuries practically ousted the separate Gospels from Christian use in Mesopotamia, was the best known and probably the most satisfactory of a whole class of similar harmonies which there is good reason to think were in common use, even liturgically, in the second century. It survives complete today only in Arabic, old High Dutch and German and Latin versions, which have all undergone a good deal of independent editing. Indeed, the chief value of this little fragment (less than a century younger than Tatian's autograph) is the light it casts on the extent of the alteration which these versions have undergone. It should also settle the vexed question whether Tatian composed his work in Greek or Syriac in favour of the former. The fragment deals with the preparations for the descent from the Cross (Matt. xxvii. 56, 57; Mark xv. 40, 42; Luke xxiii. 49-51; John xix. 38). The curious gloss by which Luke's *γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας* become "the wives of those who followed (*τῶε συνακολουθησάντων*) Him," is a noticeable instance of the freedom with which the evangelical text could still be treated (*c.* A.D. 172); for all his encratism Tatian the Oriental was shocked at the idea of unmarried women wandering about the country. This passage unfortunately casts little light on the type of text used by Tatian, except that it rather noticeably does *not* agree with D in one or two points.

The editing and production of the book fully maintain the very high standard of the series, but the price of this number separately seems rather high.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

THE REFORMATION AND REUNION. By C. Sydney Carter, D.D., Oxon. The Church Book Room. 3s. 6d.

Bishop Knox in an Appreciation draws a sharp line between the Reformed Churches and the unreformed Church, Western or Eastern, and

commends Dr. Carter's book as an effective answer to the "enormous efforts now being made to draw the Church of England from its position among the Reformed Churches into the fold of the unreformed, and to arrogate for it the supplementary powers which Rome and Constantinople claim." Particularly he commends the book "for the clearness with which Dr. Carter establishes the novelty and modernity of this claim" for the Church of England, "and its utter inconsistency with the teaching of centuries of Anglican divines." It is significant that the present Bishop of Manchester in the "sympathetic and discriminating" Foreword for which Dr. Carter thanks him, while laying stress on the value of the book as a contribution to the ultimate possibility of the reunion of the Churches of the Reformation, frankly anticipates that Dr. Carter "will not expect all who read his words to reach the same conclusions and draw the same inferences."

The first 191 pages are an historical study of the Reformation, of the attitude of Anglican divines and bishops to the foreign Reformers, and of their interpretation of the English Reformation settlement. This study is a valuable collection of dated information, but it can scarcely be said to do justice to the whole conception of the Church in the Caroline divines, nor to the distinction between the generous allowance made by Anglican bishops for the circumstances of the continental Reformed Churches and their reluctance to accept the new orders in England. Dr. Carter includes in the long list of books consulted Denny's *The Church of England and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches*, but he makes no attempt to deal with that conclusive examination of the often-asserted admission of those ministers.

The last twenty pages are a criticism and a condemnation of the approaches of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 to the Old Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Churches. These approaches are regarded as a departure from the principles of the Reformation. Was the Reformation the last word of God to the Church of England, or is it free to work at the possibilities of a reunion of all Christendom, which must not be sacrificed to the nearer possibilities of the reunion of the Reformed Churches? The Lambeth Conference is a true representation of the Church of England as seen now in the fruits of her work in the Anglican Communion. Dr. Carter's judgment is untenable in the face of three facts: (1) The same Lambeth Conference gave its general approval to the advances of the Anglican Church in India towards the reunion of Anglican and Reformed Churches in South India; (2) the Bishop of Gloucester, whom Dr. Carter cites in support of his view of the validity of non-episcopal orders, was also the leader of the advance towards the "unreformed" Churches; (3) the Lambeth Conference which approved these advances reflected all types of Anglican churchmanship, and accepted those advances without any division of opinion sufficiently large to call for the record of the votes.

It is a pity that the book is disfigured by many misprints. On p. 207 occur, for example "Lamberth," and "epsicopal."

LEWIS B. RADFORD, BISHOP.

BOOK NOTES

Behold Peter! With eighty-three Drawings by L. A. Doust, with Commentary by E. L. Macassey. Skeffington. 6s. Mr. Doust in eighty-three illustrations shows St. Peter with appropriate expression and attitude as he passes through all the New Testament incidents. It is a successful pictorial life of the Apostle, and Mr. Macassey's short Commentary is scholarly and adequate. But with regard to the napkin rolled up in a place by itself, should we say today "the neatness and method observable proved clearly that Jesus Himself must have done it all"?

W. J. FERRAR.

The Heavenly Vision: An Anthology. Compiled by Phyllis Taunton Wood. S.C.M. 5s. When he has finished this book, the reader will be puzzled by the scope of it. If it is an anthology of mysticism, written in English for English readers, the omission of Dame Julian of Norwich, Walter Hilten, and Augustine Baker, and the inclusion of numerous excerpts from Oman and Hocking, is curious. But, to be just, the book does not claim to be an anthology of mysticism, though it has largely the outlook and may be based on the Oxford Book of Mystical Verse—a sufficient condemnation. Is it then a collection of literary devotional gems? If so, it is hard to say why William Law is not even mentioned, while the banal words of an anonymous preacher on p. 110 are included. Now there may be many who still like to have "Daily Light" by their bedside; for such, the book admirably serves the purpose of introducing its readers to writers of many nations, colours, creeds, and times, and may be profitably used during their "quiet time." The following corrections should be made: p. 152, No. 11, "The Night of Foreboding" should be "Forebeing," and on p. 154 Gerard Manley Hopkins is unaccountably called Gerald.

An Anthology of Mysticism. Edited with an Introduction and Biographical Notes by Paul de Jaegher, S.J., translated by Donald Attwater and others. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d. At a time when many Christians are tempted to take refuge from the problems of the day and to shirk soiling themselves with "merely secular concerns" by enclosing themselves in a mist of prayer, it is instructive to turn to the great masters of the spiritual life and find that their prayer strengthened them for solving the problems of their day. This collection of extracts from the mystics starts with St. Angela of Foligno and ends with a mystic of our own day. It is meant for beginners who have little or no knowledge of mysticism, and the editor warns us that the collection must be regarded rather as "selected passages" than "the finest passages" from the mystics. He might have omitted with advantage the excerpts from Blessed Gemma Galgani, but the other selections are well made. The short biographical notes at the beginning of each section make the book more valuable. Provided that the book achieves its object of driving the reader to make personal experiment in the realm of prayer, it may be recommended.

G. KEABLE.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER